

1910
She is and She is not:

A
F R A G M E N T
OF THE
T R U E H I S T O R Y
O F

Miss *Caroline De Grosberg*,
alias Mrs. *Potter*, &c. &c.

EXHIBITING

A Series of uncommon Artifices and In-
trigues in the Course of her Transactions
with the Earl of Lauderdale, in the
Years 1764 and 1765.

TOGETHER WITH

An Account of the Proceedings in the Process
she commenced against his Lordship, and the
Substance of the Evidence on both Sides.

Compiled from Papers of undeniable Authenticity,

AND DEDICATED TO

Mrs. *Margt. Caroline Rudd*.

L O N D O N,

Printed for J. BEW, No. 28, Paternoster-Row.

1776.

M^{rs} Rudd

W. Musgrave

OF THE

THE HISTORY

OF

THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF LONDON



THE HISTORY

OF THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF LONDON

AND THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF LONDON

THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF LONDON

LONDON

THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF LONDON

DEDICATION

To Mrs. M. C. R-dd.

M A D A M,

ON perusing the materials from which the present publication is formed, I felt a strong inclination to offer the Dedication of it to you: not, if you will believe me, with a view of drawing a *parallel*, but of pointing out the remarkable *contrast* there seems to be between you and Miss De Grosberg, the heroine of the following pages. It must be confessed that two such personages are very rare and uncommon, and from thence (amongst other circumstances) your enemies may possibly suggest that they are not in fact *two different*, but *one* and the *same person*. But in my opinion the features and complexions of the two parties will appear to every intelligent reader at first sight to be *very different*, without entering into a critical delineation of them. For my own part, I was so fully convinced of the *disparity* between them, on a general view, that I could not read the examination of Sir T——s F——d, as related in your printed Trial, without some degree of *resentment*.

sentment. Several questions are there put to him * which plainly give countenance to the above insinuation; common justice and humanity, therefore, call on me to step forth in vindication of *such injured innocence* as yours, and
to

* "DO you know a Mrs. Potter or Porter of Hackney?—I know no such body.

Have you ever sent or enquired whether the prisoner was that Mrs. Potter or Porter of Hackney?—Certainly, I have.

I ask you to whom you have mentioned your idea of this Mrs. Potter or Porter at Hackney?—I wrote to Lord Northington about it.

Are you the prosecutor of this indictment?—Yes; I was bound over to prosecute.

Are you at the expence of it?—I do expect to pay it.

Then I ask you, whether you have prosecuted this woman as and believing her to be a Mrs. Potter or Porter of Hackney?—I know nothing at all about that: I don't know that she is, but I believe she is.

Do you know one Jane Williams?—I do not know whether I do.

Take time and consider.—I saw several people at Hackney, she might be one of them.

Have you enquired of one George Downe, whether this prisoner was that Mrs. Potter or Porter that had lived at Hackney?—I did.

Did you enquire of any woman?—I believe there were two women.

Of Mrs. Elizabeth Pendel-
low?—I know nothing of her.

Of Catharine Peake?—Catharine Peake called at my house one afternoon, and I did not speak two words to her.

But they might be very significant words; were they concerning Mrs. Potter of Hackney?—They were.

Might there not be two more Mrs. R. dds and Mrs. Potters?—Yes; there might.

That Mrs. R. dd might be this Mrs. Potter; was that the subject of your enquiry with her?—She came to my house; I asked her if Mrs. R. dd was not the same woman that was Mrs. Potter at Hackney.

How came Mrs. Peake at your house for the purpose of discoursing of Mrs. Potter or Porter? Did you not send for her?—No.

How came she then?—Perhaps somebody sent her; I never sent for her, nor know nothing of her.

Do you know who sent her?—No.

Had you given orders to your agent, or any one, to enquire for Catharine Peake?—No.

How could Catharine Peake come to your house to be asked questions by you? Did she tell you any thing, or did you interrogate her? Did you speak to her first, or she to you?—She spoke to me first.

What

D E D I C A T I O N.

to *repel* the force of this oblique charge by laying before the public an account of the life and conversation of this uncommon adventurer, whoever she may be, so far as the judicial proceedings, from which the present performance has been compiled, will furnish materials for that purpose; so that the impartial public may judge what *little foundation* there is for the spiteful inuendo above hinted at. There is this remarkable difference between the two personages in question, and the causes in which they were engaged, that Miss De Grosberg's does not appear to have been ever brought on for a final

What introduced your conversation?—She said, “I heard you wanted to speak to me.”

Now, who was your agent? To whom did you give authority to make this enquiry?—I don't know that I did.

To whom did you give authority?—Nobody that I know of.

Then, though you had given no authority to any one to enquire whether Mrs. R-dd was Mrs. Porter of Hackney, yet this woman found out your house, and came to you, and knew all the business without being told; now, what answer did you make?—I told her, I thought Mrs. R-dd was Mrs. Porter of Hackney.

Why did you believe so? Why did you tell her, and by what information was you enabled to tell her, that you believed Mrs. R-dd to be Mrs. Porter or Potter of Hackney?—I had seen Madam Groseburg's writing.

Was that the same woman

you believed to be Mrs. R-dd and Mrs. Porter?—Yes.

How came you to see Mrs. Groseburg's writing, to know that her writing and Mrs. R-dd's were alike?—Because a Mrs. Fellows, who hired Mrs. Potter to send her down to Lord Northington, to be governess of his children, gave me a note which is like her hand-writing.

Did she go as a governess?—Yes.

Did Mrs. R-dd ever go as a governess in Lord Northington's family?—That I don't know.

There are two out of four that I have asked you about, Catharine Peake and George Downe, that you remember having talked upon this subject to?—I have.

Is Catharine Peake one of the two women you mentioned speaking to at Hackney, or is she a third woman?—She was not one of those two women I spoke to at Hackney.”

determination

DEDICATION.

determination before its proper judicature, so that it may be supposed she deserted her own cause, and thereby tacitly confessed herself to be in the wrong; whereas the charge against you, Madam, has undergone the solemnity of a public trial, and you have been found by a jury of your country, *according to the evidence before them**, NOT GUILTY, and, in consequence thereof, have been *honourably* acquitted. That you may long enjoy that *inward peace* and *complacency* which *conscious virtue*, and a mind adorned, like yours, with the *finest sensations*, and most *delicate feelings*, can alone inspire, is the sincere wish of,



MADAM,

Your most humble servant,

THE COMPILER.

* See the very words of the verdict.

She is and She is not,
&c.

IN the year 1764, the Right Hon. the Earl of Lauderdale, being desirous of engaging a governess for two of his daughters, capable of instructing them in the sciences of music and geography, and the Italian language, together with other accomplishments proper for ladies of quality, directed Mrs. Fellows, of Princes-street, near Leicester-fields, a relation of his Lordship's factor, to advertise in the London newspapers for a person so qualified; in consequence of which a young woman, who called herself *Caroline De Grosberg*, was recommended and engaged, and accordingly repaired to the Earl's seat, at Hatton, about seven miles from Edinburgh, to enter upon the duties of her appointment. But soon after her arrival there, Lord Lauderdale thought proper to discharge Miss De Grosberg, as a

B

person

person utterly unfit to be entrusted with the education of his daughters. The result of this proceeding was a process in the Court of Session, commenced by Miss De Grosberg against the Earl and his Lady, which set forth, "That the plaintiff (Caroline De Grosberg) was engaged by the Earl and Countess of Lauderdale, defendants, as governess to their two daughters, at the rate of 25 guineas a year; that she was to eat in the parlour, and to have the expences of her journey to and from Hatton defrayed; that she arrived at Hatton upon the 6th of April, 1764; and that the defendants dismissed her from their service upon the ninth day after, without allowing her to take her portmanteau, in which were her cloaths, along with her; and therefore concluding against the defendants for the payment of 30*l.* sterling, as the expence of her journey from London to Edinburgh, and back again,—25 guineas as a year's wages,—and 40*l.* board-wages for that time,—with interest of the said sums during non-payment at the expiration of the year,—and to deliver back a box and portmanteau left by the plaintiff at Hatton, or 100*l.* in lieu thereof, and, moreover, 100*l.* for damages and expences of process," &c. —Such were the grounds of Miss De Grosberg's action, the merits of which we shall now endeavour minutely to investigate.

When

When the cause first came before the Lord Ordinary, the defendants represented the plaintiff to be an impostor, and profligate woman, as they alleged had been discovered by certain intercepted letters, which had come to her at Hatton, and as will be particularly set forth hereafter; and they solicited that the plaintiff should personally be examined upon interrogatories. And the Lord Ordinary, after hearing both parties, was pleased to order the plaintiff to be examined by commission; and accordingly Miss De Grosberg being interrogated on the 13th of August, the declaration she then made was to the following purport:—

THAT, about the end of February, 1764, she, the Declarant, (Miss De Grosberg) lodged at the house of Mrs. Potter, the wife of one Mr. Potter, a captain in the English service, at Himmerton, in the parish of Hackney; and that Mrs. Potter told her, that her husband was cousin to the late Archbishop of Canterbury:—That Mrs. Potter observing an advertisement in the newspapers, directing any person having the qualifications therein required, to apply to Mrs. Fellows, in Princess-street, Leicester-fields, to be engaged as governess to two young ladies of quality, she, Mrs. Potter, advised the Declarant to go and offer herself for

that place :—That Mrs. Potter told her, that she had written to Mrs. Fellows, and had an answer from her, desiring the Declarant to come ; but that she neither knew what Mrs. Potter wrote to Mrs. Fellows, nor did she see the answer written by Mrs. Fellows to Mrs. Potter ; and a letter, dated at Hommerton, 23d February, 1764, signed *Pottre*, being shewn to the Declarant, she averred she never saw that letter before * ; . . . and, that she gave no authority to Mrs. Potter to write that letter ;—That she went in Mrs. Potter's hired chariot to Mrs. Fellows's house upon a Sunday evening, and drank tea with Mrs. Fellows, and told her that she was the young lady whom she had written for to Mrs. Potter :—That Mrs. Fellows neither shewed her the above-mentioned letter, signed *Pottre*, nor read it to her, nor acquainted her with the contents thereof ; *nor had she any conversation with her upon the subject of the qualifications required in the governess wanted* :—That, Mrs. Fellows asking her if she could get a character from any person in London, the Declarant answered, she was a stranger, not known to any person in London ; but that she was well known to a Lady Holmes, or Mrs. Holmes ; and Mrs. Fellows proposed that she should write to her for a character ; to

* Of this letter a copy is inserted at page 16.

which

which the Declarant answered, that Mrs. Fellows might write herself for such character, and gave her the address to Lady Holmes, viz. *At the Whitehouse near Bath*: That some time after Mrs. Fellows told the Declarant, that she had written to Lady Holmes by post, and had received an answer from her, giving an account of the Declarant's character, which was satisfactory to her, and that she had sent the character to Lady Lauderdale:—That the above Lady Holmes's sister was married to a Mr. Selons, who was the Declarant's guardian, and lived at Exmouth, in Devonshire:—That she was then under age, having been born December 6, 1744:—That the said Mr. Selons was a Frenchman by birth, had been 30 years in England, was engaged in the West-India trade, and had been appointed to the care of the Declarant, and her affairs in England, by Madame la Marquise de Villarnous, her aunt, who then lived at Cambray:—That she never saw the letter from Lady Holmes to Mrs. Fellows, containing her character:—That she had been come from France to England about two years and a half:—That she was acquainted with Lady Holmes at Paris, and arrived in England a few days after that Lady, and lived with her, at different places, about a year, or a year and a half, taking the charge

charge of her Ladyship's daughter, as governess, at the rate of 30 guineas a year; which daughter died a few weeks before she left Lady Holmes's family:—That, having agreed with Mrs. Fellows to serve Lady Lauderdale on the terms of 25 guineas a year, she prepared for her journey to Scotland, and received from Mrs. Fellows six guineas to bear her expences in the stage-coach to Newcastle, and also received from Mrs. Fellows a further sum, by way of loan, upon her own account, for which she gave her note of hand; but forgot whether the six guineas were included therein or not:—That the day she left London, and when she was about to take her place in the stage, Mrs. Fellows delivered to her a small paper-box, containing a peacock-feather muff, for one of Lord Lauderdale's daughters; besides which she received also from Mrs. Fellows a small box, in which was, as she was told, a gold watch for Lord Lauderdale; this she kept in her pocket, and put the muff into a deal box of her own, which was placed in the stage basket, at the back of the coach:—That the coach set out from London about 9 or 10 o'clock at night, and that upon a little bridge near Barnet, the coachman being drunk, it was laid over on one side, but not overturned, by which accident the passengers were thrown into confusion,

confusion, and she herself pretty much hurt in her arm:—That she made no enquiry after her baggage till they came to the stage where the coach and horses were changed; but then, upon examining her deal-box, she missed the muff and many of her own things, particularly a gold watch, which cost her 20 guineas; whereupon she directed the coachman who was to return to London, to make all possible enquiry upon the road for the things lost, and particularly the muff, and, if he should find any of them, to deliver the same to Mr. Crucifix, at St. James's, near the Ball-room, for which purpose she gave the coachman a written direction, with a shilling for his trouble:—That she also wrote a letter to Mr. Crucifix by the post, informing him of the misfortune which had befallen her, and desiring him to call at the inn where the Newcastle-stage put up, for a small box, with a muff, and a guinea and a half, *which she had given the coachman, to be delivered to Mr. Crucifix, to pay a debt she owed*:—That, previous to her leaving London, she had put one guinea and a half into her deal-box above mentioned, with which she had intended to pay the said debt, but was prevented by hurry from so doing; and upon finding that she had lost so many things out of that box, and, among the rest, the guinea and

and half, she did then give the coachman another guinea and half, as above recited; and declared (with reference to an allegation, which will hereafter appear), *that she did not write to Mr. Crucifix, that he would receive a guinea and a half in the box with the muff,* but that he would receive the guinea and half from the coachman:—That, from the hurry she was in when she set out from London, she was not sure, whether she put the guinea and half into the small box with the muff, or among her own things in the deal-box:—That she had received no advice from Mr. Crucifix of his receiving any of the above goods or money:—That she left London upon Monday the 27th of March, and passed a night at York, where she met with one Mr. Henderson, from the West-Indies, who was travelling northward, and who, with the Declarant and some other persons, set off in the stage from York to Newcastle, at which place they arrived on the Saturday afternoon following:—That, having been informed, before she left London, that Lord Lauderdale would send a chaise to met her at Newcastle, she did, not only on the night of her arrival there, but also the next day, make all possible enquiry at all the inns in the town, for a chaise belonging to his Lordship; but obtaining no intelligence of such chaise, she accepted of

of a proposal made to her by Mr. Henderson of accompanying him to Edinburgh in a hired chaise, as she imagined it the cheapest way she could get there, and as, having little money, she could not think of remaining upon the road in the uncertain expectation of Lord Lauderdale's chaise:—That, on Sunday afternoon, she accordingly set out with Mr. Henderson from Newcastle, and, after enquiring in vain at all the places upon the road for the Earl's chaise, arrived at Mr. Paxton's in Edinburgh upon the Wednesday (as she believed), and paid Mr. Henderson half the expences of the journey:—That, the morning after she had reached Edinburgh, she sent an express with a letter to Lady Lauderdale, to make known her arrival; and that, upon the next Saturday, Lord Lauderdale called for her at Mr. Paxton's, when she delivered to his Lordship the gold watch, acquainting him with the accident which had happened to her upon the road, whereby she had lost the muff, and received a hurt in her arm; but did not make any proposal, nor had she any thoughts, of going to Glasgow at that time.—Being asked, Whether she had said to Lord or Lady Lauderdale, or any other person at Hatton, that she had been in the Dauphin of France's family, and employed in the education of the Dauphin's children, but

C

had been discarded for being a Protestant? Miss De Grosberg positively answered in the negative, and proceeded to declare, That, after her arrival at Hatton, she told Lady Lauderdale that she understood music, and could sing, but that she could neither play upon the harpsichord nor any other instrument; that she could dance, but did not profess to be a dancing-mistress; that she could speak French perfectly well, but did not pretend to understand any other language; moreover, that she could teach all sorts of work which belonged to the education of ladies of quality, and that she often urged her Ladyship to try her at different works, but no work was ever given to her:—That she never was desired, while at Hatton, to play upon the harpsichord, or any other instrument:—That Lady Lauderdale said she herself should teach her daughters to write, and the Declarant was never desired to teach them that art; and to the question, Whether, during her abode at Hatton, she produced a piece of writing, performed by herself, to Lady Lauderdale, or any of the family, pretending it to have been done by Lady Mary, one of her daughters, in order to shew her proficiency, after having enjoined Lady Mary to tell her mother that it was her own performance?—to this question Miss De Grosberg answered, That

That she never did any such thing, and that she knew too well what belonged to the proper education of young ladies to teach them such falsehoods:—That, after she had been at Hatton some days, she acquainted Lady Lauderdale that she was desirous of going to Glasgow, in order to find out a sister to Mrs. Potter, formerly mentioned, who lived there, and who was married to an officer whose name she had then forgot, having lost a direction which she had received from Mrs. Potter to her sister-in-law at Glasgow:—That Lady Lauderdale consented to her going to Glasgow, where she was to purchase some ribbands and gauzes for her Ladyship; and that in consequence she bespoke two seats in the Glasgow stage, one for herself, and the other for Mrs. Robertson, wife to Lord Lauderdale's factor, and had made preparations for her journey; but when she was on the point of setting out, she was stopped by Lord Lauderdale, who said she should not go till he went with her. Being interrogated, Whether Mr. Henderson above-named had proposed her going to Glasgow, and to meet her there, and whether he had paid for the two places she had taken in the stage? she answered in the negative, adding, that when Lord Lauderdale stopped her, as above, she told his Lordship he ought to

pay for the two places, which he promised; though she believed such payment had not been made, as it had been demanded of her since she left Hatton. And being also interrogated, Whether Lord Lauderdale made any enquiry concerning her parentage? and what her answer was? she declared, That such enquiry was made, and that she gave for answer, that she belonged to three nations, French, Swiss, and Dutch, and that the mother of her father was sister to the old General Cronstrom, who was Governor of Bergen-op-zoom, but entered no further into the account of her family. Being further questioned, Whether she had ever said at Hatton that she was *La Marquise de Grosberg*? or that her name was *Saville*? she declared negatively to both questions, and that she never spoke there of any Marquises, Counts, or Barons, as her relations. —Being, moreover, desired by the Commissioners to give some account of her parentage, she said she did not think herself bound to enter upon that matter then, but would give an account thereof in the course of the process, if necessary. —She proceeded to declare, That she never was married, nor ever had a child; and a letter, dated St. James's, April 11, 1764, signed *Robert Crucifix*, and addressed *To Mrs. De Grosberg, at the Earl of Lauderdale's, at Hatton, near Edinburgh,*

Edinburgh, being shewn to her, she declared, That the subscription appeared to be the same with the subscription of Mr. Crucifix to other letters addressed to her, but whether the letter was of his hand-writing or not, she could not tell:—That she was god-mother to a child of Mrs. Potter above-mentioned, which child she left at *Hommerton*, under the care of a servant who was hired by herself and Mrs. Potter for that purpose; and that she, the Declarant, had been at the expence of supporting that child for some time; and that Mr. Crucifix, being an intimate acquaintance of Mrs. Potter, shewed particular regard to the said child, which she understood to be the same mentioned by Mr. Crucifix in the said letter*:—That she was ignorant of the first name of the woman with whom the child was left at *Hommerton*, but usually called her *Mally*, and sometimes *Katharine*; and that she neither had written any letter to her, nor had any occasion to know her name:—That she brought a young woman with her from *Paris*, as her own servant, whom she left with Mr. Crucifix on her departure from *England*; which servant, however, she understood had afterwards gone down to her guardian in *Devonshire*, but she had received no letter from her in

* See it in p. 27.

Scotland;

2

Scotland; her Christian name Katharine, surname forgot.—Another letter, dated April 10, 1764, signed *Katharine Peet*, and addressed on the back *To Mrs. Potter*, and also a cover, which had inclosed the said letter, and which was directed *To Mrs. De Grosberg, at the Earl of Lauderdale's, at Hatton, near Edinburgh*, being likewise shewn to her, she declared, That she was a stranger to the hand-writing both of the letter and cover, and did not know any such woman as Katharine Peet, nor any of the persons mentioned in that letter*, nor did she ever in Great-Britain pass under the name of *Mrs. Potter*, or any other than that of *Miss De Grosberg*; and added, that before she quitted London, she left her address with Mr. Crucifix, viz. at the Earl of Lauderdale's, &c.—And another letter, signed *De Grosberg*, and directed *To Mrs. Robertson, at Hatton-mains*, without a date, which was also shewn to her, she acknowledged to be dictated and signed by her†.—And, on further interrogation, she declared, That she knew no such person at Hommertown as *Mrs. Pentiloe*; that while at Hommertown, she lived in a house belonging to one Mr. Smith, which house was taken by Mrs. Potter, of whom she held a part there-

* See a copy of it in p. 29.

† A copy is inserted at p. 35.

of, and paid her for it:—That, upon the Sunday when she first called at Mrs. Fellows's house, she took in the chariot with her a woman called *Mrs. Symons*, whom she accidentally met with at a millener's in the city, and who remained in the carriage while she waited upon Mrs. Fellows, but whom she afterwards set down in St. James's-street:—That she never undertook to teach the young ladies at Hatton geography or Italian; nor did she ever hear the former spoken of there; as to Italian, she could indeed read it a little, but she did not profess to be able to teach it:—That she never said at Hatton, that Mr. Henderson above-mentioned had promised her marriage, or had signed marriage-articles.—Lastly, Miss De Grosberg declared, that all she had then said was truth.

Thus far Miss De Grosberg's Declaration, which, notwithstanding the concluding clause, carries, in many parts, a very suspicious appearance. It required, however, an answer; and consequently the Earl and Countess of Lauderdale were ordered, at the sitting of the Court in November, to prepare one by the 4th of December, specifying the facts which they would undertake to prove. An answer, or memorial, was accordingly preferred, dated the 3d of December, 1764,

the

the substance of which we shall now lay before the reader, with the same impartiality and precision we have observed in our exhibition of Miss De Grosberg's Declaration; as follows:

THE Earl and Countess having (as hath been already represented) occasion for a governess to superintend the education of the two eldest young ladies their daughters, and teach them music and Italian (they having been perfected in the French language before), wrote, in the beginning of the year 1764, to Mrs. Fellows, in Prince's-street, Leicester-fields, to make enquiry for a person of good character qualified for that purpose. As the most likely means of fulfilling her commission, Mrs. Fellows inserted in the London news-papers an advertisement for such a governess, which soon brought her the following letter (literally copied):

"hommerton Febry 23d 1764

Madam

haveing read in the news paper this Morning that there is a french Governess Place to be heard of at Your house I saw there Was to be a person of Distinkt faMaly a Native of france for which reason I take the liberty to write to you knowing

knowing a Young Lady born At
Parris from a good family the age
of Seven or eight & twenty hou
understands musick very well and
talks six Languages and understands
All sorts of fine Works and is a
prodistant and is Quallified to be
Governess to any Lady Whatso-
ever And Carrecter will be as
required if the Lady or Gentle-
men should not fix tell tuesday
next The While we expect the
Young Lady in town A Sunday
& she shall have the honour to
Wait on you a Monday Morning
if you shd et are Provided I Beg
the favour of answer with which
I remain your humble servant

Pottre

The Answer to To Mrs Potter over against Rams
be addressed Chappel in hommerton Hackney."

To this letter Mrs. Fellows address'd an
answer as directed, desiring to see and con-
verse with the governess recommended; in
consequence of which, on a Sunday even-
ing, Miss De Grosberg went to Mrs.
Fellows's house, where some friends, viz.
Mr. and Mrs. Seldon, and two of their
daughters, were then drinking tea with her;
in the presence of which visitors, Mrs.

D

Fellows

Fellows and Miss De Grosberg had a conversation relative to the latter's qualifications, when she undertook to teach playing on the harpsicord and guitar, Italian, geography, &c. adding that she could have further recommendation from one Lady Holmes, with whom she had come over from France and lived for some time.

Miss De Grosberg called upon Mrs. Fellows in a coach, in which she was accompanied by a sister of one Mrs. Pentelow, who lived at Himmerton; but her companion remained in the carriage all the time of the interview, it being incompatible with Miss De Grosberg's plan (as will hereafter appear) that she should hear what was about to pass between her and Mrs. Fellows.

After this interview with Miss De Grosberg, Mrs. Fellows wrote a letter to Lady Lauderdale, dated Feb. 28, acquainting her with the many applications which had been made for the place, but more especially with that of Miss De Grosberg, concerning whom she thus expressed herself:

" I HAVE the offer of another the most accomplished speaks fix lagagues, is capable of teaching musick on the harpsicord, and gitar understands geography sufficient to teach it works all sorts of fine works, plane work not so neat she says as many can! She was born in Paris was Governess three years
to

to the Dauphinesses Daughter, had the offer of a Sallery for life and great incouregment if she would have turn Roman caktholick but her not Consenting to it was disgarded as a unfit person She came over with Admiral Hums Lady and as been with her till very latle who will give her a good carrec-ter she is now at one Mrs. Potters who married a nevew of the archBishop of can-terbrough, lives at Homerton near Hackney Mrs Potter rote to me about her and gives her a good carrecter I answered Mrs Pot-ter & desired to see her: She is very agreeable but not handsom as the aparance of good nature and seems entirely to know herself, makes a good aperence & yet does not seem the fine Lady, unyoushal to the french she seemed rather low in spirits which might be from the losse she susstand in com-ing over the ship being in great danger of sinking Obligd them to fling Ever thing over board and her chest whent among the rest: She has no objection at all to com to Scotland prvoided tis by Land She stood hard for thirty pound pr year but at last came down to five & Twente Guines pr year the onle objection she made was din-nig at second Table: I tould her I had no authority to say that objection could be re-moved but I would make mention of it. She is com of good family—age 28."

Two other persons were also particularly mentioned in Mrs. Fellow's letter to Lady Lauderdale, each of whom offered her service for 20l. a year ; but from the above account, her Ladyship was pleased to prefer Miss De Grosberg, and directed Mrs. Fellows to engage her, on conditions contained in the following letter :

“ Dear Mrs. Fellows,

“ I THINK the Governess you mention who is at present with Mrs. Potter is fittest for us. I have no objection to the terms shall give her 25 guineas a year let her eat in the parlour and pay her expences up and down by land. As this is very high encouragement I hope she is very thoroughly mistress of what she undertakes The music in particular which I suppose she understands perfectly. I shall be glad to know what languages she speaks I suppose you have told her she has two girls under her care to dress and undress to give them all her time and the utmost attention when they are with her and teach them every thing she is capable of that I think necessary for them They are already so far advanced as makes it much more agreeable than beginning young children. I beg you will enquire her character of Mrs. Holms and particularly to her temper which I lay the greatest stress on

on If she is what I would expect by your Letter and you find her Character answer I would by no means miss her so lose no time to fix with her and let me know when she will be ready to set out I shall be impatient to hear from you and that all is settled I shall then send you a draft for the money for her journey and particular directions as to the manner of her travelling a thousand thanks for the trouble you have taken and believe me on every occasion

Yours &c

M T Lauderdale

Upon the receipt of this letter from Lady Lauderdale, Mrs. Fellows wrote to Miss De Grosberg as follows:

“ London 9th March 1764 Princes Street Leicester fields

Madam

I received a letter from my Lady Lauderdale who makes no objection to your Terms will give the twenty five guineas a year and to eat at her Ladyships Table and to bear your Expence down by Land please let me have Lady Hum's Character which is all wanting on your side her Ladyship desires to know how soon you can go down and then her Ladyship will give you particular directions as to the manner of your going down and a draft for the money and make

nq

no doubt but my Lady will make every thing agreeable to you please let me see or hear from you as soon as possible from Madam

Yours &c

E. Fellows"

Soon after writing this letter, wherein Miss De Grosberg was told that the only remaining bar to her engagement was the want of a recommendation from Lady Holmes, Mrs. Fellows received a letter subscribed with that name, and having the post-house mark and the word *Bath* stamped on the outside*; which letter recommending Miss De Grosberg in very high terms,

Mrs.

* This letter was transmitted by Mrs. Fellows to Lady Lauderdale, but mislaid at the time the Earl was preparing his answer to Miss De Grosberg's Declaration: however, it was afterwards found, and sworn to by Mrs. Fellows as directed to and received by her from Mrs. Holmes, notwithstanding she had, previous to sending it to Lady Lauderdale, cut off the blank side, on which was the direction, in order to reduce its bulk.—As the curiosity of the reader will, doubtless, incline him to wish for a sight of it, and as the occasion seems to call for its insertion, we shall here give it verbatim et literatim, except only that the letter *I* in the subscription appeared to be erased.

“ Madam Bath March the 10th 1764

at my Return from Bristol I Recd a Letter from Mrs Potter Concerning the Character of Miss Degrobeck, a young Lady whom I am Glad of a opportunity to oblige, and can with pleasure, Certify and assure the Honble Lord or Lady whom it may concern

that

Mrs. Fellows concluded the agreement with her, stipulating for her receiving 25 guineas a year wages, eating at the Earl's table, and having her charges borne down and back again in case she should quit her place.

A short time before Miss De Grosberg set off for Scotland, Mrs. Fellows gave her six guineas to defray her expences thither; and it was settled that she should go in the stage as far as Newcastle, where (the stage proceeding no farther) she was to be met by a chaise belonging to the Earl, to carry her to Edinburgh. But in a day or two after receiving this money, she told Mrs. Fellows a distressful tale of her having been arrested by a mercer in the city who had credited her for some goods, and to whom she had been obliged to pay all the money she had; and therefore most earnestly begged Mrs. Fellows to let her have fifteen guineas, otherwise she could not leave the place she was in to go to Scot-

that the above Miss Degrosback Liv'd with mee upwards of 2 years in Quality of a Companion and do assure that she is a young Lady of a Noble Family of France and every way Accomplish'd in all Respects that --- be desir'd or Expected as a Governess --- the Honble Family she is now Jngaging with I hope this Letter will answer all the the Ends Requir'd and give Satisfaction to the partys whom it may Concern I Remain Your very Humble Sert

K. Holmes"

land :

land: and Mrs. Fellows, moved with compassion, complied with her request. When the time for her departure was arrived, Mrs. Fellows thought it her duty to see her safe on her journey, and accordingly repaired to the inn for that purpose and to take her leave of her; when Miss De Grosberg, in the former pitiful manner, told her, that she had been under an absolute necessity of parting with all the money she before had received, whereby she was so reduced, that, unless Mrs. Fellows would advance her six guineas more, it was impossible for her to go: and Mrs. Fellows, having already engaged herself so far, was constrained to consent to this last request also; so that, besides the six guineas had on the Earl's account, she left London no less than 21 guineas indebted to Mrs. Fellows, upon the security of her note of hand and the following:—"Si moi je Carolinne De Grosberg je nai pas le pouvoir de satisfaire Madame fellows dans les pasce de dun ans que mor me surviene elle aura le pouvoir De prendre en generalement tous ce que je Laidez pour ce payez faite a Londré ce 22 mars 1764 De Grosberg"*

* Translation:—"If I Caroline De Grosberg have it not in my power to satisfy Mrs. Fellows within the space of one year, that, in case of my death, she shall have power to take all in general that I have left to pay herself. Done at London the 22 March, 1764.

De Grosberg."

On

On Miss De Grosberg's setting out from London, she received from Mrs. Fellows a small peacock-feather muff, to be given to Lady Lauderdale, and a small package for the Earl, in which was a gold watch, though she did not know of the watch till she gave the parcel to the Earl; the muff, however, was never delivered as desired.

When Miss De Grosberg was arrived at Newcastle, instead of enquiring for the Earl's chaise, which was there waiting for her, she set out from thence in a post-chaise, in company with one Henderson, (with whom, it should seem, she had got acquainted in the Newcastle stage,) and reached Edinburgh about the 5th or 6th of April; and having put up at Paxton's, in the Grass-market, she acquainted the Earl of her being there, upon which he fetched her to Hatton about the 8th or 9th of April.

At the Earl's first interview with Miss De Grosberg, she told his Lordship, that the stage in which she came from London had been overturned, whereby she was greatly hurt and bruised, and the muff above mentioned was lost; but the little package with the gold watch she delivered to his Lordship, and was a stranger even then to its contents; but when, on its being opened, she saw the gold watch, she gave pretty broad hints that a present of it would not
E be

be unacceptable, as she said she had lost her own by the overturning of the stage.

On Miss De Grosberg's arrival at Hatton, she broached such an account of herself and former life, that the Earl and Countess began to suspect her to be such a person as they could in no wise approve of to be a governess to their daughters; and in a day or two, being required to play upon the harpsichord, to dance, or sing, she excused herself from so doing on account of the bruises she pretended to have received by the accident which happened to the stage.

After this, Miss De Grosberg, being desired to initiate the young ladies in geography and writing, denied that she had undertaken to teach geography; but did begin to teach Lady Mary to write; in which art the child made such great proficiency, that on the third day she appeared to write as well as her governess: but Lady Lauderdale strictly questioning the child, if Miss De Grosberg had not assisted her in the writing shewn, she confessed, That, indeed, Mademoiselle had not only assisted her, but had herself written the whole of it, forbidding her to say so;—a very bad lesson for a young lady.

As soon as Miss De Grosberg might be supposed to be recovered of the hurt she had

had got in the stage, she was pressed by Lady Lauderdale to play upon the harpsichord; when she declared she could not play upon that instrument, and that Mrs. Fellows had mistaken her, for she never meant to undertake to teach the harpsichord, guitar, or dancing.

In short, Miss De Grosberg's conduct was so inconsistent, and her conversation so ridiculous and extravagant, during the eight or ten days of her abode at Hatton, that there was not a servant in the house who did not observe it; and the accounts she gave of herself to the Earl and others were so contradictory and absurd, sometimes calling herself this great person, and at other times by another great name, that the Earl thought he might be warranted in opening some of the letters which came daily to her, to see if thereby he could make any discovery of the truth. With this view his Lordship did open two letters directed for her at the Earl of Lauderdale's house at Hatton, one of which, written by Mr. Crucifix, was of the following tenor:

“ St James's 11th April 1764

Dear Madam

I HAVE the pleasure to acquaint you, that your little daughter continues very well grows very fat and is very brisk and lively

we went there last Sunday and gave to Kitty your Letter to her which I received on Saturday night last. I have received the muffle from the York Stage Coach but the box being broke I found not the guinea and a half as I supposed it fell out I am obliged to you for the Salmon but as I have not yet received it I am afraid you have not given it a proper direction Therefore when you write again let me know the name of the Ship the Captains name where he came from when he sailed and how you directed it My wife and myself intend to go to Homerton again this week the child grows a fine child and will please God be a fine strong healthy young Lady I wonder Kitty has not answered your Letter but I shall be a little angry with her for not doing so yesterday My Wife desires her best respects to you as does also Mrs Pendelowe which I had forgot in my other Letters I think you may rest yourself very happy that Miss is so remarkably well I remain dear Madam with great respect

Yours &c

Rob. Crucifix."

The other letter intercepted by Lord Lauderdale,—which was received by the same post with the above from Mr. Crucifix, and which was under a cover directed by Mr. Crucifix to Mrs. De Grosberg, &c.

in

in the same manner as his own letter,—was addressed to Mrs. Potter, and signed *Catherine Peet*. The words of it were,

“Honourd Madm

THIS with my Duty to you hoping these few lines will find you in better health than when you wrote to me Miss is in good health and has been ever since you left her I make no doubt Madam but that you are worse to ween a great deal than Miss is for she never hunts after the breast at all Mrs Crucefix and the Ladies often come to see Miss Doctor Dawson and Mr Toutmin has been to see Miss But as to Mr Fisher and Mr Downing has never once had the Complisance to call to see Miss Mrs Jones is paid Mrs Betness is paid the Baker and the man for the bag of Coals and the things are all away from the Lodging Told Mr Boon the Coachman what you ordered me and likewise Mrs Week and they said they were not uneasy about the money the news Boy wants money I told him that you would pay him as soon as you came to town James has been from Mr Woiter and wanted to see you I told him that you was gone out of Town I have not seen Mr Wortall nor Mr. Boshilive since you have been gone Madam I am very sorry to think that so long as I have served you that you should have so bad an opinion of me as to think that I should
not

not Obey your Commands in doing what you ordered I must own that I have sometimes when Madam that I was with you been dilatory tho not so out of your Sight tho I was alwise willing to serve you Madam with a deal of pleasure ever Since I came to you first and do so still And I hope shall alwise remain in my Duty to both you and Miss And I am very sorry to think that I should be any Instrument of your illness it gives me a good deal of uneasiness but I hope you will make yourself as happy in your Mind as you can about Miss for I shall take all the Care that lys in my power by night and day and I think I have followed all the orders that you left when I parted with you there is no letter since you have been gone Dear Madam I will make no doubt that you will have any wise cause to repent leaving Miss with me Madam if you have any Message to send to Batavia my Brother will be very glad to Oblige you in it for their ship is bound to Batavi as well as to Bombay the Lady has not sent her Letter to go to Bombay Madam I hope your Goodness will excuse my bad writing So no more at present I remain

Yours &c.

Catherine Peet.

P. S. My Mother Desired her Service to you & my Brother.

From

From the above letters it appeared that Miss De Grosberg had a female child at Hommerton; and from Mr. Crucifix's letter it was evident that she had made him a present of Lady Lauderdale's muff, which, although it was but of small value, shewed what sort of a person Miss De Grosberg was. All things considered, the Earl thought it high time to dismiss his new domestic, and not suffer her to continue longer about the ladies his daughters; and accordingly he did dismiss her from his house. And as Mrs. Fellows had lent her 21 guineas on her own account, he suggested that she should be paid; whereupon Miss De Grosberg desired that a small box or portmanteau of hers might be kept until Mrs. Fellows was paid; which box was then lying at Hatton, but contained only trifles, or things of little value.

Having discharged Miss De Grosberg, the Earl desired Mr. John Robertson, his factor, who was married to Mrs. Fellows's sister, to write to Mrs. Fellows to get what further intelligence she could concerning this extraordinary Mademoiselle; and Mr. Robertson accordingly acquainted Mrs. Fellows with Miss De Grosberg's conduct, and with the contents of the two intercepted letters, and with the reason there was to suppose that Miss De Grosberg was in reality no other than the Mrs. Potter at Hommerton, who
had

had recommended herself by letter to her. In compliance with this request, Mrs. Fellows did make further enquiry concerning Miss De Grosberg, the result of which she communicated to Mr. Robertson by the following letter :

“ Dear Brother

“ on the receipt of yours I went to Mr Crucifix who is Clerk to Sr Robert Willmot I asked for him ; was answered by a Young Woman about eighteen years of age whome by her aparence I should have taken for the made She told me he was out, that Mrs Crucifix was ill in bed, if I had any Message to leve she was her Daughter and would deliver it ; I desired to know if she knew one Mrs Potter She said She did ; I asked her if she knew where she was, her answer was she did not know, but belived she was gone in to the Country ; I asked her if Mrs Crucifix did not receive a Muff of a present from Mrs Potter She Sayd her Mother did receive a Muff from some body but could not tell from whome it came I begd she would favour me with a Sight of it She Sayd She could not then as the keys was under her Mothers head and She was a Sleep ; but if I would call the next day she would shoue it me, I according went the next day but was answered Mr Crucifix was

was gon out and had lockt it up in his Buroue I have been at Hummerton and have seen the woman Mrs Potter or the pretended Mrs Decrofburg lodg'd with, I asked her if she knew Mrs Potter she told me she did and that She had Lodg'd with her several Months and that She was sartainly now in france and was a french woman—I desired her to describe her person She very reddenly did and I discribed the cloaths I had seen her in which Mrs Pentloue well remembered and Sayd She must be the same Mrs Pottar, in short I give Mrs Pentlou my reasons for such an inquire and how I had been deceived by her I asket her if she had Ever heard her talk of one Lady Hume She Sayd She had I asked her if Lady Hume had made her a present of a black Sattin Cloke and bonnet three or four days befor She left Hommerton, She Sayd She had a new Cloke and bonnet and that she knew the Shop She bought it in, whereas she had tould me Lady Hume had sent it from Bath of a present to her, but a still greater proof that Mrs Decrofborg is the same Mrs Potter Mrs Pentlow sister at the request of Mrs Potter came with her in a Hackne Coach the first time I had the Misfourturn to See her to my dore and sate in the Coach at the dore the whole time Mrs Potter Excused herself in not asking her into

F

the

the hous; by telling her the people of the hous was all strangers to her, onely one Gentleman that was going to france and had business of consequence to transact for her in-france she passed for a married woman but Mrs Pentlow says she verily believes she is a kept woman that She owed her for Lodgings when she left her but a fine Gentleman called and paid it: there is no room left to doubt but that she is Mrs Potter, and that the Letter I reced from Bath was a forged Letter You desire to know if I can prove by two Witneses that she undertook teach Musick Italian Geography yes I can prove it by five Witneses if required the first time Mrs Decroßburg came to me was at a Sunday Evening I had Mr and Mrs Sheldon and two of there Daughters drinking tea with me when she came in, Miss Dyse was one of them; and both Mr & Mrs Sheldon are both willing to make their affidavit that she undertook to teach musick on the Harpsicord and gutare Italian Geography &c. Mrs Pentilows Sister is likewise willing to make her affidavit that she came with the said Mrs Potter to my dore that same Sunday Evening & sat in the Coach the whole time and returned the same night to Homerton with said Mrs Potter Mrs Pentlow says she has frequently heard Mrs Potter say that it was out of the power of
any

any body to hurt her for no body either knew her or her right name I do most sincerely wish she may finde herself mistaken and that she may receive the Justice due to such a deceiving Impostor, should there be any thing more requisite we are ready to comply with it

The note inclosed is my own wrighting signed by the pretended Decroßburg* as she sayd she could not right English and am your affect Sister

Eliz. Fellows."

The day after her discharge, Miss De Grosberg wrote, or dictated and signed, a very extraordinary letter to Mrs. Robertson, wife of the Earl's factor, which is too interesting to be omitted on the present occasion. It runs in the following bombastic terms:

"Mrs Robertson

"I AM very sory that you are so apt to believe the falsness that is rose against me through Letters of Report I have the honour to tell you if it is the invention of a Woman that she is a good for nothing whore and if a Gentleman the greatest villain that can be being perswaded that no mortal of Reputation can say any thing against my

* This was Miss De Grosberg's note of hand given to Mrs. Fellows for the 21 guineas borrowed of her, as before related.

character and Reputation I flatter my self to be Irreproachable upon any fault whatsoever and would be sorry to Committ such a low lifd action as my Lord did tax, me to day for as to send back to London a peacocks feather'd muff for a present to my Acquaintance not worth a Sixpence after the loss I did thirty pounds value If I had been inclined to send a present I would have sent my Lords Gold watch which I did remit him safe.

“ I must Confess that any person that would Steal a muff would be Guilty of worse for which reason I shall endeavour by what means I can to clear up my character through the attestation I shall produce that a person of my acquaintance here has wrote for this night to have remit from the three Gentlemen and a married Lady who came out of London with me that live in that City It would be in vain for me to send for the attestation of Mrs Johnston of Dumfries while she only mett us in the Coach at Grantham with one Officer so that I make myself very easy having an opportunity to clear myself through all Scotland & and England and hope that my Lord will do all that he can against me for I have friends sufficient to sustain me in all my Cause and shall prove my Lord If I am Miss Potter or Miss Grosberg I shall make it an honour to tell

tell my name through the whole world and hopes my Lady will not think it a dishonour to have got my person at her Table while I think for all the Ill fortune I may have being a Baroness born that is equal to all the Nobilities with their Riches I remember my Lord told me that if I was not quiet he would he would give me into the hands of Justice F——g for the peacocks feather Muff while I have the pleasure of knowing the same Gentleman I wrote him this very day that I stood in great Chance to be his Customer but I hope that his Lordship will treat me with more Goodness as to send me to London in a ffish ship for a guinea and a half while I have letter my Lady wrote to Mrs Fellows which will give me my money without asking which well pay me my Journey by land

“ What concerns in Bussiness I have with your Sister at London shall be finished in five or six days which will give me more opportunity to finish what I shall take in hand and to Convince the world that I am not ashamed of my action I shall be published in every news paper in the Kingdom You remember I told you the difficulty I had with my Parents this two years with coming to England but in case of necessity they will never reject me to clear me out of the trouble I might happen to be in and
am

am resolved to Conquer it and will be a lesson to every Lord and Lady to use any Governess to use any Governess of a family better as my Lord has done me I shall not move out of Edinburgh before I have an answer I lodge not at Mrs Paxtons but at a friends house don't think Mrs Robertson that I think you are in the fault of it but I hope to Convince you that am quite another person and in which hope I remain your humble Servant De Grosberg

" P. S. I did not say much at my Lords house for I was afraid I should not get a Chaise into Edinburgh"

Lord Lauderdale, animadverting on this letter, observed, that in it Miss De Grosberg used expressions not very becoming a governess to young ladies; that her acquaintance with J—— F——g was no recommendation to her; and that she made herself a Baroness, although afterwards in her Declaration she disclaimed any such title.

Having stated the grounds of Miss De Grosberg's action, which we have recited at the beginning of this publication, the Earl then proceeded, in pursuance of the direction of the Court, to give in a specification of the facts he would undertake to prove, by arguing, from the premises, that Miss De Grosberg appeared to be a woman

woman of a very bad character, and moreover incapable of teaching the young ladies what she undertook ; both which separately were relevant defences against the action. Particularly,

1. She appeared to have recently had a bastard child ; for, as she, in her Declaration, averred that she was never married, the child mentioned in Mr. Crucifix's letter, if hers, must have been a bastard. Miss De Grosberg, in her Declaration, endeavoured to explain away that matter, by alleging that this child was a child of one Mrs. Potter, and that she was only god-mother to it : but, upon due consideration of Mr. Crucifix's letter, it was evident, that he was writing concerning a child of her own ; and Katharine Peet's letter could be looked upon in no other light than as relating to a child of her own : and, though Miss De Grosberg was pleased to say, she knew not the hand-writing of Katharine Peet's letter, yet that it was in reality her writing was corroborated by Mr. Crucifix, who had said, that the woman who kept the child, and whom he called *Kitty*, was to write to her about it. And this supposition concerning the child received additional support from Mrs. Pentelow's telling Mrs. Fellows, that she verily believed Miss De Grosberg to be a kept-mistress, from
the

the circumstance of a fine young gentleman's coming to pay for her lodging after she had left it; which was more probable than Miss De Grosberg's tale of her being at the expence of maintaining one Mrs. Potter's child, whilst she herself was not only obliged to go to service, but was at the same time in great distress, arrested by a mercer, borrowing near a year's wages before entering upon her service, and yet in want of money, whence the natural conclusion was that the child must be her own. And all this reasoning was confirmed by Miss De Grosberg's not producing any letter from the said Mrs. Potter, giving an account of the child, which there was time enough to have procured, had there been any truth in what she alleged.

2. It appeared, that Miss De Grosberg had sent the muff she was entrusted with the care of in a present to her friend Mr. Crucifix. In her Declaration she had said, that, in going down to Newcastle, the coach was overturned, by which accident the muff was lost; and that she directed the coachman, if he found it in his return, to carry it to Mr. Crucifix's, at the same time acquainting Mr. Crucifix by letter with her misfortune: but this story was not supported by Mr. Crucifix's letter, wherein, indeed, he acknowledged the receipt of the muff
and

and the letter, but not one word did he mention of the overturning of the coach, which, doubtless, he would have done, had Miss De Grosberg informed him of it, as he was so particular in regard to other less important matters; for instance, the salmon which he said she had sent him. But, very unluckily for Miss De Grosberg, credible information had been received, that the coach was not overturned at all.

3. The Earl contended, that Miss De Grosberg passed under different names, and particularly under that of *Potter*, at Hommerton; and that there was great reason to believe, that she herself was the writer of the first recommendatory letter to Mrs. Fellows, as also of the second signed Holmes or Holme; for Mr. Crucifix, in his letter, told Miss De Grosberg, that Kitty, who had the care of the child, was to write to her; which she accordingly did by the same post, addressing her letter to Miss De Grosberg by the name of *Mrs. Potter*. This letter was plainly intended for her, as it was sent under a cover to her at Hatton. Mr. Crucifix was in the secret, and well knew to whom Kitty meant to write when directing to *Mrs. Potter*; and consequently Mr. Crucifix, who had sent his own letter to the post before Kitty's came to his hands, inclosed

G

hers

hers in a blank cover, and addressed it, as he had done his own, *To Mrs. De Grosberg, at the Earl of Lauderdale's house at Hatton*; which evidently shews, that Kitty's letter to Mrs. Potter was for Mrs. De Grosberg. Further, Mrs. Pentelow and her sister assured Mrs. Fellows, that it was a Mrs. Potter who lodged in their house; and, a description being given of her, she turned out, to all appearance, to be Miss De Grosberg. Mrs. Pentelow's sister accompanied her to Mrs. Fellows's house on the Sunday evening when Miss De Grosberg paid her the first visit, and she remained in the coach while Miss De Grosberg was in the house, it not being proper that she should be present to hear what passed; for then she would have discovered that the person she knew by the name of Potter went under the name also of De Grosberg, and was going for Scotland; particulars which were to be concealed from Mrs. Pentelow and her sister. And as Miss De Grosberg was anxious, for obvious reasons, to avoid any knowledge of these Pentelows, she pretended, in her Declaration, that it was one Symons whom she had in the coach with her, and whom she took up by accident; whereas, in truth, it was Mrs. Pentelow's sister, whom she took with her in the coach from Himmerton: besides,
Mr.

Mr. Crucifix, in his letter, makes Mrs. Pentelow's compliments to Miss De Grosberg, which would be the height of absurdity, if she knew no person of that name at Homerton.

4. The Earl alleged, that Miss De Grosberg was a woman of very loose behaviour, and of ridiculous conversation, which could not but be observed by the servants at Hatton whilst she was there, and which made it very improper for her to remain any longer with the young ladies. Of this charge her letter to Mrs. Robertson afforded evidence, wherein she was pleased to make use of the indecent expressions of a woman's being a good-for-nothing whore, and a gentleman's being the greatest villain that can be;—expressions never used by any woman of a decent and virtuous education; and she was also pleased in said letter to acknowledge her acquaintance with Justice F——g, under whose jurisdiction, though he be a very deserving magistrate, it is well known what sort of women commonly fall.

5. The Earl averred, that Miss De Grosberg did give herself out for this great person and that great person, sometimes assuming one name, at other times another; and this was in some measure corroborated also by her letter to Mrs. Robertson, in which she speaks of herself as being a Baronness

born, notwithstanding in her Declaration she disavows having ever assumed any high title, such as Marquise, &c. Moreover, when engaged, she said she was eight-and-twenty years of age, whereas she now declared herself to be going twenty only;—which is an age by much too young for the employment she undertook.

6. It was insisted upon by the Earl, that Miss De Grosberg did, amongst other accomplishments, undertake to teach music, Italian, and geography, for either of which she was quite unqualified; nay, she even owned herself unable to play on any instrument, particularly the harpsichord and guitar: and it was inconceivable what Miss De Grosberg meant, when she said, that, though she could not play upon these instruments, yet she could teach them; which to common-sense seemed impossible. That Miss De Grosberg did undertake to teach as above-mentioned, could be proved by Mrs. Fellows, and by the persons who were present at her house the Sunday evening Miss De Grosberg first called there; whence it would be incumbent on her to prove that she was capable of so doing.

The foregoing first five articles, the Earl, concluded were undoubtedly relevant, as touching Miss De Grosberg's character, and, if true, rendered her a very unfit companion
for

for young ladies, and consequently were sufficient to justify the Earl in turning her off, especially as she had not thought fit to produce a letter from any person whatever in vindication of her character. And the Earl, with submission, alleged, that, before further proof of those five articles should be required of him, it was incumbent on Miss De Grosberg to obtain a letter from the supposed Mrs. Potter, the Archbishop's niece, and also from the Lady Holmes or Homes, in favour of her character, mentioning the particulars they wrote in recommendation of her to Mrs. Fellows; and further, that she ought to produce a letter from Mr. Crucifix, informing what he knew of her, as to her moral character, &c. for although he might, to serve a friend, who kept her as his mistress, have interposed his kind offices, yet, it was presumed, his honesty would not permit him to advance falsehoods in her behalf: moreover, it seemed necessary that the affair of the child at Hommerton should be explained by a letter from the supposed Mrs. Potter. No doubt, if Miss De Grosberg merited a good character, Mrs. Potter, Mr. Crucifix, and Lady Holmes, would be very ready to give her one; and until this was done, the Earl contended, that he could not be put to the trouble of a proof of the said five articles, but that they must stand good against her.

As to the 6th and last article, which related to the subjects Miss De Grosberg engaged to teach, and her inability to fulfil such engagement, that was incontestibly relevant; and proof could be adduced of what those subjects were: but as the preceding articles respecting her moral character were relevant *per se*, they fell first under consideration.

To this Memorial the Lord Ordinary ordered an answer to be made on the part of Miss De Grosberg, and one was accordingly prepared, bearing date the 10th of December, 1764. It commences with a recapitulation of the particulars contained in her Declaration, with some few additions and explanations, and then proceeds to parry the Earls attacks with great dexterity. Of the former part we need select and insert the additional matter only (having already given the Declaration at length), but shall be particular in laying before the reader what tends immediately to the refutation of the articles offered to be proved against her by the Earl.

With reference, then, to the characters given of her by Lady Holmes and Mrs. Potter, Miss De Grosberg says, in this answer, that she was engaged as Governess to
 Lord

Lord Lauderdale's two daughters, by Mrs. Fellows, in consequence of her reliance upon the character received from Lady Holmes, and that no dependence was then had upon that said to have been given by Mrs. Potter, to which Miss De Grosberg was an entire stranger.—After the agreement was made, Mrs. Fellows gave Miss De Grosberg the letter which the former had received from Lady Lauderdale, directing her to lose no time in closing the engagement with the latter upon the receipt of a good character of her from Lady Holmes; and the reason Miss De Grosberg assigns for Mrs. Fellows's giving that letter to her was, because she (Mrs. Fellows) said Lord Lauderdale's family were a little capricious in their humour; therefore, that letter would be a security against whatever might happen to her.—After Miss De Grosberg's arrival at Hatton, when she desired to enter upon the charge of the two young ladies, it appeared that Lord and Lady Lauderdale did not chuse the young Ladies should be under her care; and, upon the 9th day of her abode there, they suddenly dismissed her from their family, without assigning any cause, without pointing out to her any fault committed by her in their house, and without having made trial of her in the different branches of her duty as governess.

Amazed,

Amazed, and unable to account for this sudden dismissal and unprovoked hard usage, Miss De Grosberg, a stranger in that country, was turned out of doors, to shift for herself, without money in her pocket, and without any expectation of being taken into any other family, after such a notorious disgrace put upon her by the Earl and Countess of Lauderdale. To add to these accumulated misfortunes, Miss De Grosberg's portmanteau, with all her cloaths, was secured by his Lordship's order, as if she had been guilty of theft whilst in his family; which, indeed, was the idea the world entertained, and the only way in which they could unriddle his Lordship's conduct towards her.—

Miss De Grosberg then mentions the action she had brought against Lord and Lady Lauderdale for the redress of her injuries; and gives an account of the Declaration she had been obliged to make on an examination by interrogatories, which leads her to speak to the several charges brought by the Earl and Countess against her, on which she animadverts with great subtlety. After premising, that it would be almost impossible, without a very tedious prolixity, to follow the Earl through every particular detail of the circumstances insisted upon, she proceeds, with as much brevity (she says) as possible,

possible, to consider the most material things contained in them, and endeavour to answer each as they occur;—which she does in the following manner.

The plain end and design of the Memorial was to prove Miss De Grosberg an impostor, a whore, a thief, and a forgerer. These accusations Lord Lauderdale founded upon the suspicions he conceived of her immediately on her arrival at Hatton, and the knowledge he said he got of her by breaking open two of her letters.—What right had his Lordship to break open and keep back those letters? Does the law allow any person to plead his own offence to detect that of another? Surely, the mere curiosity to know what Miss De Grosberg's family and conduct had been, would not justify that freedom.—But.

1. Miss De Grosberg was charged with imposture in that she had disguised her real name, which was Potter, and under the fictitious name of De Grosberg obtained the office of governess to Lord Lauderdale's daughters.—Now, it was a thing past doubt, that Mrs. Potter did reside at Homerton, and that she and Miss De Grosberg were equally unknown to Mrs. Fellows. Supposing that Mrs. Potter wished to get into the office of governess under a feigned name, she must have had some reason for
H concealing

concealing her real name and assuming another ; and the only reason that could in such circumstances he imagined, was a consciousness of a bad character attending the name of Potter, and a confidence in the name of De Grosberg : but if her own character was in the least degree suspicious, and still more if it was really bad, she would not have written to Mrs. Fellows under the proper name of Potter, to recommend herself under a borrowed name. Hence it followed, that the whole scheme of imposture alleged to have been carried into execution by Miss De Grosberg, was inconsistent and improbable, wild and violent, to the last degree. This charge of imposture was attempted to be proved from the intercepted letter of Katharine Peet ; of whose handwriting Miss De Grosberg had in her Declaration disclaimed all knowledge. Indeed, she was not obliged to admit, that any letter directed to Mrs. Potter ever came under a cover, as she never saw it till she made her Declaration. However, Miss De Grosberg could not be answerable for all letters which might be inclosed in her covers, persons having often had letters directed to them which they knew nothing of, and sometimes with an intention to ruin them. How absurd the Earl's reasoning ! It would have been equally easy, and much more proper, for

for Katharine Peet to have used the pretended false direction, viz. that of Miss De Grosberg; and it cannot consistently be imagined that she would set on foot such an imposture without instructing Katharine Peet to carry it on by means of the false direction. But Miss De Grosberg averred in her Declaration, that her name then acknowledged was the same she had always been known by; that Mr. Selons was guardian to her as bearing that name; and consequently that Katharine Peet's letter could not be intended for her; and she should be able to prove, that the letter directed to Mrs. Potter, was sent to her at Hatton in order to be forwarded to Mrs. Potter, as it was not known at London where she was gone, but conjectured only that Miss De Grosberg knew her address, and would dispatch the letter to her.

2. Miss De Grosberg was charged with having recently had a bastard child;—which allegation had no other support than the intercepted letter of Mr. Crucifix, in which are these words: “I have the pleasure to acquaint you, that your little daughter continues very well, grows very fat, and is very brisk and lively.”—From the intimacy and friendship between them, Miss De Grosberg stood godmother to a child Mrs. Potter was brought to bed of at Hom-

merton, which was baptized the 10th of August, 1763. Upon Mrs. Potter's hastily quitting England, much involved in debt, this child was left behind her at Hommer-ton, and afterwards maintained by Miss De Grosberg; and the money she allowed by her for that purpose being disbursed by Mr. Crucifix, it was no wonder that he should write concerning her little daughter, though he thereby meant Mrs. Potter's child, her god-daughter. In England, nothing is more common than for persons to call those children to whom they stand sponsors, their sons or daughters. By the laws of that kingdom, the care of children, in case of their parents desertion, or inability to provide for them, falls immediately upon their god-fathers or godmothers; and it is the practice of most parishes in that country, to take the sponsor's bond, (when the parents, being strangers, are unknown to the clergyman who performs the office of baptism,) that the child baptized shall not become chargeable to the parish *.——Bound, therefore, by the laws of the country to take the charge of the infant for whom she had answered at the font, Miss De Grosberg thought herself equally bound

* We confess, we know of no such laws or practice as Miss De Grosberg here ascribes to the English nation.

to do so by the laws of humanity also. Yet it was alleged by Lord Lauderdale, that this whole story of Miss De Grosberg's maintaining another person's child, was improbable in the extreme;—but what was it to his Lordship how great an expence she incurred in maintaining that child, since she solicited nothing from him for the purpose. Had she been as poor as he imagined her to be, she must have starved before that time; but, thanks to heaven, she was not only able to maintain herself and god-child, but also to prosecute, in due course of law, so powerful a defendant, for the aggravated injuries she had suffered. But why multiply arguments *ex hypothesi*? Miss De Grosberg could prove, that she did stand god-mother to the child in question, which was Mrs. Potter's, and to which alone the letter written by Mr. Crucifix referred: and Miss De Grosberg defied the Earl to prove that she ever did bear a child, or that she ever betrayed the least unchastity.—Mrs. Fellows, in her long letter to Mr. Robertson, giving an account of the result of her officious assiduity in making enquiry concerning Miss De Grosberg, said, that she first hastened to Mr. Crucifix's, and asked his daughter whether she knew one Mrs. Potter? Now, Mr. Crucifix had no daughter, but two young boys

boys only ;—a pretty strong presumption that Mrs. Fellows's tale was apochryphal. Mrs. Fellows also pretended she had seen a Mrs. Pentelow, with whom she said Mrs. Potter lodged ; and that from Mrs. Pentelow's description of the person of Mrs. Potter, and Mrs. Fellows's description of Miss De Grosberg's cloaths, it appeared that they were one and the same person ! In answer to this curious reasoning, Miss De Grosberg could not assert, whether, prior to the commencement of the acquaintance between herself and Mrs. Potter, the latter might not have resided in another house in and about Hackney or Hommerton ; but of this she was sure, that, during their stay together, they hired lodgings from one Mrs. Smith, and that she herself never had lodged at Hommerton with the said Mrs. Pentelow. As to what Mrs. Fellows alleged as a still greater proof that Miss De Grosberg was the identical Mrs. Potter, inasmuch as, she said, Mrs. Pentelow's sister, at the request of Mrs. Potter, accompanied her in a hackney-coach the first time to Mrs. Fellows's house, and remained in the coach during Miss De Grosberg's visit there, that lady, it was remarkable, did not certify whether that sister's surname was Pentelow, or not ; however, Miss De Grosberg was very positive,

sitive, that the woman who went with her in the chariot to Mrs. Fellows's door, was one who then passed under the name of *Symons*. Another circumstance which Mrs. Fellows urged as a proof that Miss De Grosberg was Mrs. Potter, was, that Mrs. Pentelow believed her to be a kept-woman: but, in the name of wonder, what was that to the purpose? Whatever skill Mrs. *Pentelow* (if any such person there was, for Miss De Grosberg knew her not) might have of kept women, or in whatever manner Mrs. *Potter* might have behaved with her when in her house, (if she ever was there,) could not affect *Miss De Grosberg*, until it was proved that she and Mrs. *Potter* were one and the self-same person.

3. An accusation of theft was implied in the allegation, that Miss De Grosberg sent the muff with which she was entrusted by Mrs. Fellows, in a present to her friend Mr. Crucifix.—The stage in which Miss De Grosberg went from London was laid over near Barnet, by which accident the muff being lost, she desired the coachman to make strict enquiry for it, and, if he found it, to carry the same to Mr. Crucifix; — facts more particularly set forth in the account Miss De Grosberg gave of this matter in her Declaration, but which Lord Lauderdale controverted, on the plea
that

that it was not supported by Mr. Crucifix's intercepted letter, wherein he acknowledged the receipt of the muff, but mentioned not a word of the accident happening to the coach, which he undoubtedly would have done, had he known it. Now, it was very observable, that Mr. Crucifix mentions his having written *other letters*; in which he very probably did take notice of that accident, and of the unsuccessful enquiries he had at first made after the muff. But where, then, were those letters? Really, Miss De Grosberg did not know; she received none of them, and thought herself at least unlucky in that respect, as she was confident they would not have hurt her. Mr. Crucifix did not thank Miss De Grosberg for the present of the muff, but said only that he had received it, and that the box was broken, which last particular, in some measure, confirmed Miss De Grosberg's account of the loss of it out of the stage-coach. But, after all, this terrible story about the *peacock-feather muff* was very far from being consistent or probable. Could it be imagined, that Miss De Grosberg would purloin so insignificant a trifle, worth a few shillings only, and not tell the same story about the gold watch, which it was acknowledged she delivered safe to Lord Lauderdale? But, indeed, his
 Lordship

Lordship averred, that Miss De Grosberg did not know she had charge of a watch, until, at the time of its delivery, she saw the packet opened in which it was inclosed; whence it was insinuated, that, if she had known it, she would have made off with the watch also. But the Earl was egregiously mistaken; for the truth was, that Miss De Grosberg was very conscious of her having received a watch from Mrs. Fellows, first from that lady's telling her so, and afterwards from opening the timber-box wherein it was given to her, and changing it for a small paper-box, as well that it might lie more commodiously in her pocket, as that she might be certain of the value of the goods she carried with her. Mr. Crucifix never understood that the muff was sent as a present to him, but kept it only to be sent to Miss De Grosberg in the manner she should appoint; but as his letters to her were intercepted by Lord Lauderdale, she had not an opportunity of hearing that he had ever received it. However, after seeing that letter from Mr. Crucifix which was first shewn when she made her Declaration, she gave directions to him concerning it,—received it accordingly,—and was ready to produce it whenever she should be required.

4. It was not enough for Lord Lauderdale

dale to endeavour to prove Miss De Grosberg a thief, but his Lordship must also be desirous of making her a forgerer, by alleging that there was great reason to believe, that she wrote the letter or character in her recommendation, which is signed by Mrs. Holmes;—a very vague story truly! Miss De Grosberg gave Mrs. Fellows a direction to Mrs. Holmes; she accordingly wrote, and received an answer in due course of the post: Mrs. Fellows sent Mrs. Holmes's letter to Lady Lauderdale, and that letter her Ladyship received, though she had not produced it*. Very extraordinary, therefore, was it to accuse Miss De Grosberg of forging that letter; and no argument could be offered against its being the genuine and true letter of Mrs. Holmes. Nevertheless, the Earl was bold enough to require, that Miss De Grosberg should procure a letter from Mrs. Holmes in vindication of her character. Now, in the first place, to what purpose was a second letter required from Mrs. Holmes concerning Miss De Grosberg? If she forged one letter, as was pretended, she might likewise forge another letter. But, in the next place, what was required

* We have already apprized the reader, that this letter was at first mislaid, but afterwards found; and a copy of it is inserted at pages 22 and 23.

quired, had it been reasonable, was impossible; for Mrs. Holmes was dead.

5. Miss De Grosberg was represented as a woman of very loose behaviour, and of ridiculous and absurd conversation; which fell under the notice of the servants at Hatton.—Though Miss De Grosberg by no means imagined, that Lord Lauderdale's servants at Hatton were her peers in a trial of that kind, yet she presumed that her behaviour would stand the test of the strictest examination, and could not forbear remarking, by the by, that her loose behaviour should not have fallen under the observation of the Earl himself, who could not be supposed wanting in all necessary circumspection in that respect:—but her behaviour was the reverse of loose. As to the letter she wrote to Mrs. Robertson, cited by Lord Lauderdale as evidence of the charge, it ought to be considered as written at a time when she had the greatest reason to be irritated and provoked with the harsh and cruel treatment she had met with, and when she felt that resentment by which every virtuous mind must necessarily be agitated, upon being so unjustly injured as hers had been.

6. Lord Lauderdale averred, that Miss De Grosberg did give herself out for this great person and that great person, sometimes assuming

assuming one name, at other times another; and that was confirmed by her saying, in her said letter to Mrs. Robertson, that she was in some measure a Baronness born, notwithstanding in her Declaration she had denied ever having assumed any title of quality.—This strange and intricate charge could not be well answered till his Lordship's meaning was rendered less obscure. It was to be wished the Earl had explained what he meant by the terms *this great person* and *that great person*, as such descriptions and language were, to Miss De Grosberg, utterly unintelligible. His Lordship's allegation, that Miss De Grosberg, in her Declaration, disclaimed any title of eminence, such as Baronness, was a great misrepresentation. What she had therein advanced upon this head she still avowed, which was, that, *while at Hatton*, she never said she was the Marchioness De Grosberg; and that, during the time she staid there, she never spoke of any Marquisses, Counts, or Barons, as her relations. It was Miss De Grosberg's misfortune to be but too well descended for the condition in life she was in with regard to Lord Lauderdale, and for the repeated indignities and affronts she had experienced in this country; and it was, perhaps, a consciousness of her being out of her com-
mon

mon sphere which made her so uneasy till she got those dishonourable stains wiped off. It was not incumbent on Miss De Grosberg to gratify Lord Lauderdale's curiosity by making a parade of her parentage and family. She was positive, that she had never passed under any other name than that of De Grosberg, and under that she demanded legal redress: and to this, even supposing herself to be one of the lowest rank, Miss De Grosberg conceived she was intitled equally with a Lord, convinced as she was, that, in this land of liberty, the laws were not like spiders webs, made to catch small flies only, while greater ones broke through.

Miss De Grosberg, having thus considered the various charges against her moral character, which, if true, she acknowledged would have rendered her "a very unfit companion for young ladies," next animadverted on Lord Lauderdale's plea, that he was in a more especial manner justified in discharging Miss De Grosberg from his service, inasmuch as she had not thought proper to produce a letter from any person whatever in her vindication, and that it was incumbent upon her, before his Lordship was troubled with any further proof of his several allegations, to produce a letter from Mrs. Potter, to clear

clear up the matter of the child ; and also letters from Lady Holmes and Mr. Crucifix, giving her a good character.--Miss De Grosberg styled this the most wondrous request that ever was made to a court of justice. Lord Lauderdale had given in a specification of the facts which he offered to prove, and yet at the same time endeavoured to shun a proof of them. *Affirmanti, non neganti, incumbit probatio*, was a maxim of law most certainly to be followed in this case. How then could the charges stand good against Miss De Grosberg in that stage of the business ? She had denied them ; she had accounted for them ; and she still offered, upon a conjunct probation being allowed, to redargue every allegation against her. However the Earl might be troubled with what he called " a further proof," that was no fault of Miss De Grosberg, but the necessary consequence of his own illegal and unjust conduct towards her.---With respect to the letters required to be procured by Miss De Grosberg, to clear up the affair of the child, and to fix her good character, she would only observe, that this very request of the Earl shewed he was merely suspicious of her conduct, that, therefore, he had been hasty and rash in publicly loading her with defamation ; and that she did
not

not chuse to follow his example of producing letters written at his own solicitation *pendente lite*.—And as to the Earl's charge relating to her inability of discharging the duty of a governess, it was needless at that time to dwell long upon it. Miss De Grosberg was positive, that she never undertook any thing but what she could honourably execute; and it was incumbent upon the Earl to produce the advertisement in the public papers, which was the foundation of the whole affair; as well as Mrs. Holmes's character of her, upon which the agreement was made between her and Mrs. Fellows.

Miss De Grosberg concluded with observing, that several other matters were grossly misrepresented. Thus, particularly, it was said, "That Miss De Grosberg, upon her arrival at Newcastle, did not enquire for Lord Lauderdale's chaise, which was there waiting for her, but set out from thence in a post-chaise."---The fact was, (as would be clearly proved,) That Miss De Grosberg arrived at Newcastle at the house of Mr. Parker on the Saturday; and, immediately upon her arrival, enquired there, and afterwards at the other inns in the town, for his Lordship's chaise, without being able to hear a tittle about it. She also staid at Newcastle
till

till the evening of the next day, expecting to hear of the chaise; but then, beginning to lose hope of its arrival, and having not sufficient money to bear her expences in a strange place, she accepted (as before related) an offer which one Mr. Henderson made her, of going to Edinburgh with him in a post-chaise; and, surely, it was neither imprudent nor extravagant to take that first opportunity of going to Edinburgh, notwithstanding the insinuations which Lord Lauderdale had from that circumstance thrown out, that there was too great an intimacy between Mr. Henderson and herself. The Earl's chaise, as Miss De Grosberg was informed, did not arrive at Newcastle till after she had left it.

Upon consideration of the above, as well as of Lord Lauderdale's memorial, the court, in December 1764, ordered the noble defendants to produce a proof of the facts urged against the plaintiff, and required the same from Miss De Grosberg with respect to the circumstances of her answer and apology. The agents therefore on both sides were by this sentence authorized to take the depositions of witnesses, in both kingdoms, in order to the final settlement and determination of the suit.

To this, however, Miss De Grosberg objected, not, as she said, from any dread

of the enquiry, which, conscious of her innocence, she could smile at, but from the inconvenience and expence arising from the procrastination of her cause. She therefore prayed the Court to appoint a shorter day, in compassion to her situation and circumstances, as she was distressed by the detention of her cloaths, and laboured under the load of unjust scandal, which, for the sake of her honour and reputation, she naturally wished to be removed as soon as possible; but that without such a vindication and reparation she could not, however inconvenient, think of leaving Scotland. Six weeks therefore she presumed would be sufficient to produce and compare proofs, for which his Lordship as the accuser might be justly supposed to be prepared, and therefore could not want a more distant day. And these proofs should be confined to the facts already exhibited against her, and not extended to any fresh matter or ground of accusation.

This petition, dated December 13, 1764, received a long answer from the Earl, circumstantially reciting from the very beginning the transaction between himself and the plaintiff, wherein he sets out with observing, that, if he was not greatly deceived, from the evidence already produced, and from other expected testimony,

K

she

she would appear as grand an impostor, as ever was imported into this country: that the case, however, was so complicated, and contained such variety of matter, that it was impossible to collect the evidence and arrange the circumstances in due order in a shorter day than was appointed: that the great object of all proof was to discover the truth; and the proof of one fact led to the discovery of another.—But as the Earl did not mean to derive any advantage from Miss De Grosberg's supposed ignorance of the particulars he meant to prove, he with this answer exhibited a reformed and more precise specification of all the matters then had in view; though he did not thereby mean to relinquish the privilege of proving such other facts and circumstances as might arise.

The above-mentioned reformed and special specification of facts intended to be proved by Lord Lauderdale against Miss De Grosberg, consisted of twenty-three distinct articles, formed from his Lordship's detail of the matters in agitation between him and his prosecutor. As the reader has already seen the ground of these articles in the Earl's Memorial, we think it needless to repeat them, especially as we shall give abstracts of the proofs themselves.

On

On the 20th of December, 1764, after due consideration of Miss De Grosberg's petition and the Earl of Lauderdale's answer thereto, the Lords unanimously found, That no proof should be allowed, except what was contained in the Defenders special rectified specification and facts relative to it, and ordained the proof to be reported against the 10th of February, 1765. And on the 22d their Lordship's issued an act and commission directed to Mr. Henry Davidson, in London, and granting full power to him for taking the depositions of witnesses to be adduced in behalf of Miss De Grosberg :---also an act and commission, empowering Mr. Alexander Wight, Advocate, to take the depositions of such witnesses as should be produced on the part of the Earl of Lauderdale at Edinburgh ; together with another act and commission, empowering Mr. George Urquhart, to take the depositions of his Lordship's witnesses in London.

A conjunct probation being thus granted, and the time for making the report shortened agreeable to Miss De Grosberg's Petition, both parties prepared for their proofs without delay. And on the 9th of January, 1765, Miss De Grosberg personally presented Mr. Davidson with the act and commission issued by the Lords, empowering

beginning

K 2

him

him to take depositions in her favour, of which he accepted; and, having appointed a clerk, he proceeded to the examination of witnesses accordingly.

*Substance of the Proof taken in favour of
Miss De Grosberg.*

M—— S——, wife of Mr. J—— S——, of C——-street, London, deposed, That she had been acquainted with Miss de Grosberg about a year or eighteen months; that she considered Miss de Grosberg to be a maiden lady, living on her fortune, and was told by her that she had a guardian, whose name was Sellon, living near Exeter, to whom her husband wrote a letter from Miss De Grosberg. Mrs. S—— also deposed, that one afternoon she accompanied Miss De Grosberg in a chariot (hired as she supposed) to a street close by Leicester-fields, where the chariot stopped at a house into which Miss De Grosberg went, and staid a few minutes, but she never was informed on what business; and that this (as she believes) happened in the winter season, though she could not recollect the day nor month, having frequently been out with Miss De Grosberg in a chariot and hackney-coaches.

Mr. J—— S——, husband to the above deponent, in general confirmed his wife's evidence; and added, on being interrogated on the part of Lord Lauderdale, that some time after Miss De Grosberg had left his house, having received advice that she was going into the country, he took a writ out of the Marshalsea-Court against her, for a debt she then owed him of about four pounds; and that he accompanied the officer to the house of one Mrs. Pentelow, in Hackney or Hommerton, where Miss De Grosberg was arrested in Mrs. Potter's room, which arrest was immediately discharged

discharged on payment of debt and costs. He said, he never knew that she passed under any other name than De Grosberg.

Mary Hole, wife of John Hole, of Hackney, deposed, that she had been acquainted with Miss De Grosberg upwards of a year; that one Mrs. Potter, who said she was wife to a Captain Potter, lodged in her house; that Miss De Grosberg used to come backwards and forwards to this Mrs. Potter, frequently staid nights, and sometimes slept with Mrs. Potter, and sometimes by herself, but that Mrs. Potter only paid for the lodgings; that Mrs. Potter was delivered of a child in the house of this deponent, who was present at the delivery, but did not recollect whether Miss De Grosberg was also present or not, but she was said to have stood god-mother to the child when it was baptized; that this deponent supposed Mrs. Potter to be a French woman, and lodged her for eight or nine months, but knew nothing further either of her, her husband, or family. And the deponent being interrogated for Lord Lauderdale, Whether Miss De Grosberg then present was the person who had been delivered of the female child, she deposed, that she was not the woman, but that it was another woman, viz. Mrs. Potter, who was delivered of the child.

John Hole, husband to the above witness, confirmed most of the particulars of his wife's testimony, and deposed further, That Mrs. Potter held only one room in his house, but frequently made use of other rooms, when the lodgers were absent; that the said Mrs. Potter and Miss De Grosberg (which last was then present) were two distinct persons, that he had seen them frequently in company together, and that it was Mrs. Potter whom he believed to have been brought to bed in his house; that Mrs. Potter and Miss De Grosberg lodged at Mrs. Pentelow's at Hommertons, after they had left his house; and that Miss De Grosberg had mentioned to him, that she was of a family of rank in France,

The further examination of witnesses was adjourned by the Commissioner to the 12th of December, notice being given to the agent for Miss De Grosberg, that her personal attendance during the examination of all the witnesses, as well under the commission granted on her own behalf, as under that of the Defendants, was expected; the question being in a great measure a question of personal identity, which made her presence absolutely necessary.

Nevertheless, Miss De Grosberg did not attend on the day of adjournment, whereupon the agent for Lord Lauderdale objected against proceeding in the commission; till, on some future day, Miss De Grosberg should make her personal appearance: on the other hand, Miss De Grosberg's agent was urgent for proceeding forthwith; but the Commissioner, thinking it unjustifiable so to do without Miss De Grosberg's appearance, after the notice given at the last meeting, adjourned the business till the 14th of December, at 12 o'clock.

At the time last appointed, the Commissioner, having informed the two agents, that Miss De Grosberg had a few minutes before called at his door in a coach, and promised to return immediately, submitted it to the parties, Whether or not he should proceed to the examination of witnesses without

without waiting till she should be come back? Upon this Lord Lauderdale's agent represented, That, as he had had an opportunity, together with the Commissioner, of seeing Miss De Grosberg, and also, by following the coach from his door to the end of the next street, of shewing her to several persons intended to be examined on the part of Lord Lauderdale, who were thereby enabled to swear positively to her person,---he should not oppose the Commissioner's proceeding as proposed; which was done accordingly by interrogating and taking the depositions of the following persons:

Katharine Peet deposed, That she knew one Mrs. Potter who lodged at Hackney, and afterwards at Hommerton, and who appeared to be a French lady; that this deponent entered into her service the last August-twelvemonth, about a month after she had been delivered of a female child, which she from that time took care of, and then had with her; that, whilst Mrs. Potter lodged at Hackney, another French lady, called Miss De Grosberg, (who, she positively swore, had brought her in a coach that morning to the Commissioner's house,) came frequently backwards and forwards to Mrs. Potter, and sometimes staid all night, on which occasions Mrs. Potter and Miss De Grosberg always slept in separate beds and rooms; that, afterwards, Mrs. Potter went to lodge at Mrs. Pentelow's, at Hommerton, where also she was at times visited by Miss De Grosberg, who, however, did not remain there at nights; that she had not seen Mrs. Potter during the last seven or eight months; that she had been told Miss De Grosberg stood godmother to Mrs. Potter's child; that Mrs. Potter suckled the child

child herself; that, by order of Mrs. Potter, she wrote a letter concerning Miss De Grosberg to a person in town, and a letter dated Hommerton, Feb. 23, 1764, (*inserted at p. 16,*) and signed Pottre, being shewn to her, she averred the same to be entirely her own hand-writing, except the subscription, which was written by Mrs. Potter; and another letter, dated April 10, 1764, signed Katharine Peet, and addressed to Mrs. Potter, (*inserted at p. 29*) being also shewn to the deponent, she declared that the said letter was of her own writing, and that she delivered the same to Mr. Crucifix, to be forwarded by him to Miss de Grosberg, and by her to Mrs. Potter, to whom she had no immediate direction herself; that this deponent had heard Mrs. Potter say, that Miss De Grosberg came out of the West country from one Lady Holmes; that she was not acquainted with the hand-writing of Miss De Grosberg, nor ever received a letter from her, nor ever knew of her passing under any other name; that Mr. Downing, apothecary at Hackney, (then present,) had attended Mrs. Potter and her child in the way of his business, but never Miss De Grosberg; that Mrs. Potter had very few acquaintance, nor did any one visit her (to the best of the deponent's recollection) except Miss De Grosberg; nevertheless, upon particular interrogation, the deponent acknowledged that Mr. and Mrs. Crucifix visited Mrs. Potter at Hommerton, and slept one night there, and that she had seen them in company with Mrs. Potter, but could not recollect whether Miss De Grosberg was present at such time or not; on the contrary, to her knowledge, she never saw Mr. Crucifix and Miss De Grosberg together; that about five days after Mrs. Potter was gone, the deponent received from Mr. Crucifix a letter without name or date, but which, from the contents, she considered as coming from Mrs. Potter, and to which the letter dated April 10, 1764, before mentioned, was the deponent's answer; that Mr. Crucifix told her, when he gave her the letter, that it came from her mistress by the way of Miss De Grosberg; and he directed her to let

let him have all letters for Mrs. Potter, that he might forward them to her by Miss De Grosberg's means; that she supposed Mrs. Potter to be a married lady, and that she saw a gentleman with her whom Mrs. Potter spoke of as her husband, and who seemed to be an officer in the army; that the deponent had seen this gentleman about four times at Mr. Hole's, and once at Mr. Pentelow's, but, so far as she knows, he did not sleep with Mrs. Potter at either place; that Mr. Crucifix had, from the time of Mrs. Potter's departure, paid this deponent at the rate of a guinea per month for taking care of the child; that it was after Christmas when Mrs. Potter left Mr. Hole's house to lodge at Hommerton; that Mrs. Potter, whilst at Mr. Pentelow's, frequently hired Mr. Boone's chariot, but, as far as this deponent knew, Miss De Grosberg never did; that this deponent was Mrs. Potter's servant, not Miss De Grosberg's; that, as she believed, Mr. Wright, vintner at Hackney, (then present,) was acquainted with Mrs. Potter, but not with Miss De Grosberg; that she had seen *Mrs. Potter* and *Miss De Grosberg*, two separate and distinct persons, several times in one and the same room in Mr. Pentelow's house; and that by the name of *Mrs. Potter*, as used through the whole of her deposition, she meant a distinct and separate person from *Miss De Grosberg*, and that by the name of *Miss De Grosberg* she meant another person distinct and separate from *Mrs. Potter*, but that she did not know where *Mrs. Potter* then was.

Mr. *Robert Crucifix*, of the Lord Chamberlain's office in his Majesty's household, deposed, That his acquaintance with Miss De Grosberg began about three weeks before she went to Scotland, by her coming on a visit to his family, at his apartments in St. James's, with Mrs. Westall, wife of Mr. Westall, of Hommerton, (with whom he had been long intimate,) on which occasion Miss De Grosberg was introduced to him as a French lady who lived at Hommerton. The deponent at that time happening to be ill of the gout, Mrs. Westall invited him to her house in the

country, and on his observing that she had not a bed to give him, Miss De Grosberg said she could accommodate him with one which belonged to a lady who was gone abroad. His disorder continuing, Miss De Grosberg repeated her visits three or four times; and the account he heard from herself was, that her name was De Grosberg, that she was the daughter of a nobleman in France, and that her father had attempted to marry her contrary to her inclinations, to avoid which she was forced to leave her family; and that she had met with in Flanders, and accompanied to England, an English lady of the name of Holmes, and the wife or widow of Admiral Holmes. On the deponent's recovery, he went to visit his friend Mr. Westall at Himmerton; but finding that he and family were then in London, the deponent enquired of their servant where the French lady was, and being directed to Mr. Pentelow's house, he there found Miss De Grosberg, with whom he and his wife drank tea, supped, staid all night, and breakfasted next morning, and afterwards dined with her at Mr. Westall's, without hearing her called by any other name than the general one of *Mademoiselle*. On entering the room wherein Miss De Grosberg was in Mr. Pentelow's house, he found her with a female child in her arms, whom he thought to be the same which Katharine Peet had that day with her at the Commissioner's; and Miss De Grosberg told the deponent, that this child was the daughter of a French lady, a friend of hers, who was gone abroad; and that she herself was its godmother, and had undertaken the care of it. Katharine Peet was present while this passed, but soon afterwards went away with the child. This deponent believed, that Miss De Grosberg lay in Mr. Pentelow's house the night he slept there, because early in the morning he was disturbed by the cries of a child immediately above him; however, he could not positively say with whom the child slept, but was informed next morning by Miss De Grosberg, that it had been very ill. Soon after this, Miss De Grosberg called upon the deponent
at

at his own apartments, and acquainted him with her intention of going into Scotland on a visit to Lord Lauderdale's family; adding, that, if she did not meet with success in Scotland, she should go from thence into France. She then gave him six guineas, with directions to pay one of them per month to Katharine Peet, for taking care of the child above mentioned, till she should return, or he should hear further from her. She also left with him 25 shillings, to discharge the lodgings at Mr. Pentelow's, in the name of *Mrs. Potter*, telling him at the same time, that that lady had not left her money sufficient to pay the lodgings, so that she was obliged to advance the rest herself. This, to the best of the deponent's recollection, happened the day before she set off for Scotland. A trifling sum, besides, was left in the deponent's hands, for Katharine Peet to discharge with it some debts at Himmerton, but Miss De Grosberg did not particularly mention whether those debts were her own or *Mrs. Potter's*. The deponent further said, that he thought he received a letter from Miss De Grosberg on the road to Scotland, mentioning her being overturned and losing some things; but, as he had not been able to find that letter, he could say nothing more respecting its contents. In a subsequent letter, Miss De Grosberg spoke of a muff which she had sent up by the York stage, with a guinea and half, in a box directed to him, in consequence of which he went to the inn in Holborn where that stage put up, but without getting any intelligence of it: a few days afterwards, however, the box was brought to his apartments, with a feather muff in it; but the bottom was loose, and no guinea and a half could be found, of which he complained to the porter who brought it. He denied receiving any directions in regard to the disposal of the muff, or considering it as a present to himself, and said he delivered it to Miss De Grosberg on her return to England. The deponent then exhibited five letters, which he had received by the common post, and verily believed to have been written by Miss De Grosberg;

berg; and accordingly he answered such of them as required him so to do: and the letter dated April 11, 1764, (*inserted at p. 27,*) he acknowledged to be his writing, and a part of the correspondence just mentioned. Being interrogated on the part of Lord Lauderdale, the deponent said, that he knew nothing of Miss De Grosberg's understanding music, nor did he ever hear her play on the hapsichord or any other musical instrument, but had often heard her sing, and had been told (for he was no judge of music himself) that she sung true and strong, but harshly: indeed, she was said to have used a harpsichord which stood in his house, but he never saw or heard her make use of it. He was not conscious that *Miss De Grosberg* ever went by any other name, having understood from her, that the name of *Potter* was that of a French lady her friend, who was gone abroad, and of whom she had the lodgings, and in whose name they were continued. Being questioned, whether he believed this story, the deponent answered, that he did at the time he heard it, but now began to change his opinion, from the circumstance of one of the five letters above mentioned being signed *C. Pottre*, which he did not duly attend to before; and further acknowledged, that, from a more strict examination of the said letters, a suspicion began to arise in his mind, that the child above mentioned might be Miss De Grosberg's own child, notwithstanding he had formerly always imagined it to be Mrs. Potter's, though he had never seen that lady, nor even heard of her but from Miss De Grosberg. The deponent did not remember ever receiving or forwarding any letter from or to *Mrs. Potter*, except one letter from *Katharine Peet* (*inserted at p. 29,*) and another to her. He said, he never saw any French woman at Mr. Pentelow's besides Miss De Grosberg, or, indeed, any other woman, except Mrs. Crucifix, Mrs. Pentelow, her sister, and servants. He declared, that he had last seen Miss De Grosberg in company with her agent the day he made his deposition, that she informed him she was the plaintiff in the present action, and

and that she was the same person he had visited at Mr. Pentelow's, and afterwards corresponded with by letters. He averred, that he did not suppose the letter he forwarded from Katharine Peet, as above mentioned, was intended for *Miss De Grosberg*, but considered it as sent to her care to be conveyed to *Mrs. Potter*; but being questioned whether he still continued to think so, he owned he began to be staggered in opinion concerning that matter.

Upon concluding Mr. Crucifix's examination, the Commissioner, at the request of *Miss De Grosberg's* agent, and afterwards, by consent of both parties, adjourned the meeting to the 9th of February, on which day, however, neither *Miss De Grosberg* nor her agent attended. But

John Hole, and *Mary* his wife, two witnesses before examined, appeared, and requested to have their depositions read to them (*see p. 69*); which being accordingly done, they, with great seeming contrition, declared, That the evidence severally given by them, and just read, so far as the same related to two separate and distinct persons under the names of *Mrs. Potter* and *Miss De Grosberg*, said to have lodged in their house at Hackney, was false, and that the plaintiff, whom they saw at the Commissioner's house, and called *De Grosberg*, was the person, and the only person, who lodged in their house under the name of *Mrs. Potter*, and the same and only person known to them under the different names of *Mrs. Potter* and *Miss De Grosberg*. *Mary Hole* further declared, that the said *Miss De Grosberg* was the person whom she saw delivered of a female child in her house, as mentioned in her deposition; and *John Hole* also further declared, that *Miss De Grosberg* was the person whom he understood and believed to have been delivered of the said female child at his house.—The Commissioner having asked the said *John* and *Mary Hole*, What could be their motives for having given evidence on oath

oath directly contrary to what they now declared? they severally answered, That Miss De Grosberg, by a piteous representation of the distress and oppression which she said she had suffered from Lord and Lady Lauderdale, and by telling them that the only way by which she could obtain relief would be proving herself a distinct and separate person from Mrs. Potter, had unhappily prevailed upon them, contrary to the truth and their own consciences, to perjure themselves by swearing that falsity.

The truth of the above extraordinary declarations Hole and his wife offered to attest on oath, but were refused by the Commissioner. Indeed, that gentleman was much distressed, on reflecting whether in point of form and usage he could receive them at all; but the declarants having indicated the deepest compunction, and earnestly and repeatedly requested him to take the same, he complied, and, in his report to the Court, says, that if he erred, his intention was good.

Such was the proof taken at London on the behalf of Miss De Grosberg under the commission issued for that purpose. What follows is the purport of a number of affidavits made in several parts of the kingdom in support of her cause :

On the 7th of June, 1765, *Isabel Parker*, wife of William Parker, Innkeeper at Newcastle upon Tyne, swore, before Henry Eden, Esq; Justice in that town, that Miss De Grosberg arrived by the York stage at her house in Newcastle on the 31st of March, 1764, in company with another lady and a gentleman who called himself Henderson; that she enquired immediately for Lord Lauderdale's chaise, and a messenger was sent to the other inns in that town, but without hearing

hearing of it, which made her uneasy; and that she waited till four o'clock in the afternoon of the next day, when receiving no intelligence of the said chaise, she was advised to take half a post-chaise with Mr. Henderson above mentioned, with whom she accordingly set off for Edinburgh.

Jane Williams, widow of Thomas Williams, smith, of Spitalfields, (and mother of Katharine Peet by a former husband,) swore, on the 30th of May, 1765, before Joseph Girdler, Esq; one of the Justices for Middlesex, That *, in July, 1763, she nursed one Mrs. Potter, wife of a captain, and delivered her of a female child (the man-midwife, Mr. Rossoliere, coming too late); and that *Miss Carolina De Grosberg*, present at this deposition, was godmother to the said child, and still kept it. On the 5th or 6th of February, 1765, the deponent heard, that Miss De Grosberg was arrived from Scotland with a commission to examine her witnesses; and the deponent was subpoena'd as one of them, but was prevented from complying therewith by the obligation she was under of attending a lying-in woman, dangerously ill, in which employment she had been ever since, so that she could not before spare a day for this declaration. She then attested, that, on the 8th of February, 1765, Elizabeth Pentelow, at whose house Mrs. Potter had lodged for six weeks or more, came to her at the house of 'Squire Smith, where she was nursing the lying-in lady, and asked her if she would gain a sum of money, by a method worth six or seven months nursing. The deponent asked what was the method that would make her rich so soon? You know, answered Mrs. Pentelow, that Mrs. Potter, who lived at my house, is gone nobody knows where, and has abandoned her child; but there is a great sum of money depending from a Lord of Scotland, for the

* This extraordinary affidavit, which strikes directly at the above representation of John and Mary Hole, and at the testimony of some of the most essential witnesses examined on the part of Lord Lauderdale (as will be seen in the sequel), is given with very little abridgment, that the reader may be the better enabled to judge of its credibility.

benefit of this child, if another French woman can be found and forsworn to be Mrs. Potter. I should be very glad, returned the deponent, to assist this poor child, but how is it possible for me or you to swear another person to be Mrs. Potter? Mrs. Pentelow replied, It is very easy; there is a wicked jade of a French woman, who was godmother to the child, and is willing to be Mrs. Potter, though before us she will deny it; but we must have the courage to swear it in her face. She dares do you nothing, as there will be present a Lord, who is called Capt. Maitland, and would immediately put her in bridewell. He was yesterday at my house, and had his hair dressed. I came for you, but you was not at home. He told me that you should have seven guineas reward, as I shall have, and my sister Peggy Harrison, and Boone the coachman, and Wright of Bobs-hall tavern, and Downing, and Mr. Fisher, and many other witnesses that we shall buy; and Mr. Hole, though he has sworn in favour of the French Madam De Grosberg, my Lord Capt. Maitland has been with one Mr. Dych to Hole's, and promised him an office of 300l. a year, if he would go next Saturday (the 9th of the month), with his wife, to Mr. Davidson's, to retract, and swear that all is false which he has sworn for the French lady; which he has promised to do, and received seven guineas for the same before us all. My Lord Capt. Maitland says, that he has found out a Jew, named Cortissos, who has sworn the French Madam De Grosberg to be one Madam Rochette, in order to make her an impostor, and that she should have got a child by another Jew called Silva; and he has produced letters of Madam De Grosberg's own hand, out of the West country; but my Lord Capt. Maitland says, it is all an imposition, and it is found out that them letters were wrote through the French lady for another; but no matter, the Jew is willing to swear it upon her, and has received 25 guineas for it, so that he is in more danger than we are. My Lord Capt. Maitland has given me money to make you drunk in what liquor
you

you please; but I know, Mrs. Williams, you will do it without that; but if you'll come out, we will drink a dram together; and, pulling out a guinea, she said, This is one of the guineas of my Lord Capt. Maitland; and Mrs. Fellows is now in the street waiting for an answer. The deponent being struck with surprize, asked Mrs. Pentelow and her sister (*by whom, it seems, she was accompanied*), if they were not ashamed to damn their souls for a little money? they surely did not think what they were about. Mrs. Pentelow said, there was no harm, as she was not inventor of these things, but had instructions from Mrs. Fellows, who told her that they risked nothing, as my Lord Capt. Maitland's brother was a grand peer of Scotland, who ruled all the justice there. The deponent told her, he might rule who he pleased, but should not rule her. On the 9th of February, Capt. Maitland and Mr. Dyck sent for the deponent, and had a coach in waiting to take her to town; but she denied herself; but a few minutes after the said Captain came himself, and accidentally finding her, first offered her as much money as she would have, to induce her to go; but finding that in vain, he threatened her, till she, not knowing what to do, called her master, who set him off, and she saw him no more.—But about seven or eight days afterwards, the deponent was sent for in the middle of the night to Mr. Hole's wife, in the agonies of death, and found with her the Rev. Mr. Pennington, of Hackney, before whom Mrs. Hole asked the deponent if she had seen Katharine Peet, and knew where Miss De Grosberg was. She answered she did not, though she believed she was gone to the West country; but what did she want with Miss De Grosberg? if any message, she would do it. Mrs. Hole replied, You see me, Mrs. Williams, in the last hour, where God finds me for my wickedness; and I cannot part from this world without having asked pardon from Miss De Grosberg for what I have done to her. You know she obliged me to go to town to swear the truth, how that she was not Mrs. Potter that you

M

nursed

nursed here, but was godmother to the child; but, unfortunately for me, for want of money, and thro' many promises made by Capt. Maitland to my husband, I did go and forswear myself, in denying the truth, what I had sworn before for Miss De Grosberg, since which I have the death-stroke, and shall no more recover: so I beg you, for God's sake, to go to town, and find Miss De Grosberg out. Three minutes after these words, Mrs. Hole expired in the deponent's arms,—but what day of the month it was the deponent had forgot.

John Sampson, merchant, *Johanna* his wife, *Samuel Sampson*, brushmaker, and *Alexander Sampson*, fuller, all of Exeter, swore, on the 31st of January, 1765, before Jacob Rowe, Esq; mayor, That they were acquainted with Miss Caroline De Grosberg (then in Exeter), she having lodged with one Pickard, a taylor in that city, and that during her stay there she went by the appellation of *Miss Caroline De Grosberg*, and no other, bore a good character, and was looked upon by them as a virtuous lady.

John Pickard, of Exeter, taylor, and *Elizabeth* his wife, swore, on the same day, and before the same magistrate, That they were very well acquainted with Miss Caroline De Grosberg (then in Exeter), she having lodged and boarded with them for eight months, during which time she passed under the name of *Miss Caroline de Grosberg*, and no other; bore a good character, was looked upon by them as a virtuous lady, and was under the care of Antony Sellon, merchant; and that she left them and went to London in 1763. They further deposed, that they knew one *Miss La Rochette*, who was a teacher at Mrs. La Touche's (then dead), and was intimately acquainted with the said Miss Caroline De Grosberg; but, as Miss La Rochette had left Exeter for some time, they could not tell where she then resided.

Marie de La Rochette (above mentioned) swore, on the 1st of February, 1765, before Jo. Davis, Esq, Justice in New Sarum, Wiltshire, That, in 1762, she was acquainted with Miss Caroline De Grosberg, who

who then lodged and boarded with one Mrs. Pickard, in Exeter, about which time the deponent having occasion to correspond on private affairs with one Mr. Silva and Mr. Cortissos, and not chusing, for secret reasons, to correspond in her own name or under her own hand, the said Miss Caroline de Grosberg offered to write letters, and subscribe them with her own name, for the deponent; and accordingly she did so write letters to the said Mr. Silva and Mr. Cortissos, wherein they were made to understand that the deponent had changed her name, and was represented under the name of *De Grosberg*. The deponent further said, that Mr. Cortissos had never seen her in his life, nor had any acquaintance with her, except by the above letters; and that she lived, at the time of making this deposition, with Sir John Watters, late colonel in the Devonshire militia, and then residing near Andover, in Hampshire.

The following certificate, extracted, Sept. 14, 1764, from the register of christenings belonging to St. John's, Hackney, concludes the evidence adduced in favour of Miss De Grosberg:—"Carolina, daughter of Charles and Carolina Potter, baptized 10th August, 1763."

We shall now proceed to lay before the reader the examinations of the witnesses in behalf of the Earl and Countess of Lauderdale, part of which were taken at Edinburgh, and part at London. It is to be observed, however, that, on account of the extraordinary length of many of them, the redundant and less interesting passages are omitted.

Substance of the Proof taken at Edinburgh in favour of Lord and Lady Lauderdale.

Mary Drummond, a quaker in Edinburgh, deposed, That the only time of her seeing Miss De Grosberg

was on a tea-visit she made to Mrs. Graham, with whom Miss De Grosberg lodged, at which visit she said, in the deponent's hearing, that she was daughter to that gentleman who was then at the Hague in quality of ambassador from the French King to the States-General; and that, when she was last at London, she went to court, where she met with a lady who had been the Queen's governess, and came over with her Majesty, and who had likewise been her own governess. This lady introduced her to the Queen, who ordered an apartment in St. James's for her. Nothing further remarkable passed, except that, mention being made of Miss De Grosberg's lawsuit with Lord Lauderdale, she said she did not want money from his Lordship, and whatever damages she might recover, she was resolved to give in charity to the poor. On interrogation for Miss De G. the deponent acknowledged her behaviour was polite and consistent.

Margaret Richan, wife of David Graham, wig-maker in Edinburgh, deposed, That Miss De Grosberg lodged at her house from the 1st of November to the 26th of December, 1764, said she was born in France, and left that country because her father wanted to marry her contrary to her inclinations.— One evening, the deponent saw the back of a lady very genteely dressed going into Miss De Grosberg's room; and a little Black boy, who attended her, coming into the kitchen, she asked him If his lady was married? Where she lodged? and How long she had been in Edinburgh? To which questions the boy answered He did not know. But after the lady was gone, Miss De Grosberg told the deponent, that it was Lady Charlotte Edwin, one of the Ladies of the Bedchamber to the Princess Dowager of Wales, who had been with her, and that she was no less surprized than rejoiced at the visit, having had no notice of her being in those parts.

Mr. *James Sholto Douglas*, advocate for Miss De Grosberg, (but cited by the defendants,) deposed, That, in Dec 1764, he lodged in the same house with Miss De Grosberg in Edinburgh; and one evening

evening in that month, as he was passing by her room, the door of which was open, he saw a strange lady near the fire-side, apparently making a curtesy. After she was gone, Miss De Grosberg coming into the deponent's room to consult about her cause, his curiosity prompted him to enquire who that lady was. Miss De Grosberg answered, That she was Lady Charlotte Edwin, one of the Ladies of the Bed-chamber to the Princess Dowager of Wales, whom she had become acquainted with at the house of one Lady Harding in London; and that she had been enquiring after her a great part of that day, but could not find her out before, and indeed was surprized to find her in a room of that kind; upon which Miss De G. observed to Lady Charlotte, that, if she had enquired after the French whore, the people of the town would soon have led her to her lodgings. She further told the deponent, that Lady C. was come from England on purpose to be her protectress, and to thank everyone who had assisted her in her present circumstances.

Barbara Gray, wife of *John Paxton*, keeper of the New-Inn, in Edinburgh, deposed, That Miss De Grosberg, accompanied by Mr. Henderson, came to her house on a Tuesday afternoon some time between March and May, 1764, and that she remained there till Saturday, and Mr. Henderson till Monday or Tuesday following. On the day of her arrival, she made no complaints; but next day she said she was sick, whereupon Mr. Wardrop the surgeon was sent for: at the same time she also mentioned her having met with a disaster by the overturning of the stage between London and York, adding that she had had a fever upon the road, and was all blistered. During Miss De Grosberg's and Mr. Henderson's stay at the deponent's house, they generally ate together, and the chambermaid complained of being kept up, by waiting till Miss De G. went to her room from Mr. Henderson, with whom she used to sit at nights in the dining-room. Miss De Grosberg said, he was nephew to a lady who had brought her from France as her guardian, and that he had 1400l. or 1500l. a year near London.

Though

Though Miss De Grosberg arrived at the inn above mentioned, in her way to Lord Lauderdale's, on Tuesday, it was Friday evening before she sent notice thereof to Hatton; but a letter, written by the deponent's husband or son, (the lady pretending she could not write English,) being then sent, Lord Lauderdale himself came to Edinburgh the next day: however, Miss De Grosberg told the deponent she did not chuse to go in the chaise with his Lordship, on account of his being a stranger; upon which the Earl ordered a chaise for her alone. Before she went to Hatton, she told the deponent, that when she should attain the age of 25, she should be her own mistress, and have an independent fortune. About a fortnight afterwards, on her return from Lord Lauderdale's, in his Lordship's chaise, she said she had left the family, the Earl having used her ill; and added, that a French marchioness was as good as a Scots countess at any time, and that it was an honour for Lord Lauderdale to have her in his house. After staying one or two nights, she went, as she said, to see Mr. Henderson at Glasgow.

Margaret Aitken, the chambermaid, confirmed her mistress's testimony, and said, that Miss De Grosberg told her, on coming back to the inn from Hatton, that her father was as good a man as Lord Lauderdale, and one of the most substantial men in the country where he lived.

James Thomson, writing-master in Edinburgh, deposed, That some time in April or May, 1764, he was sent for to write a letter for a foreign lady then at the New-Inn. She accordingly dictated a letter, and to a fair copy written by the deponent subscribed the name M. ROBERTSON; and then the deponent addressed it to Mr. Henderson at Glasgow. As to the contents, so far as the deponent could recollect, it began with some complimentary words, as if coming from a stranger; and then proceeded to set forth, that a lady named De Grosberg, who had been some time in Lord Lauderdale's family, had lately absented herself, on account of some difference that had happened,

pened, but which might be accommodated if she would return; and this Mr. Henderson was desired to advise her to do, if he knew any-thing of her. The letter also mentioned, that, if there was any matrimonial contract between Miss De Grosberg and Mr. Henderson, it should be made evident; but, if there was no such contract, the letter-writer was of opinion, he should have nothing to do with her, but rather make his addresses to one more like himself. It concluded with an intimation, that what was written proceeded from a friendship for Lord Lauderdale's family, for Miss De Grosberg who had left it, and for Mr. Henderson, to whom it was supposed she had flown. From the deponent's description of the above foreign lady, no doubt remained that she was Miss De Grosberg herself, as he verily believed her to be.

Jean Maitland, daughter of Capt. Thomas Maitland, deposed, That she was told by Miss De Grosberg at Hatton of a brother she had at Batavia, and was shewn by her a letter addressed to the Countess D'Odiön and Grosberg, pretending it to be directed to herself, and to be a letter of thanks from two gentlemen who had been taken prisoners, but released, upon her application, by the Duc de Nivernois. Miss De Grosberg also told the deponent, that Mr. Henderson was Mrs. Potter's nephew, had lately arrived from the Indies, and was worth 9000l. a year. The deponent was witness to Lady Lauderdale's desiring Miss De Grosberg to play upon the harpsichord, when she excused herself by pleading the bruises she had received by the overturning of the coach. Miss De Grosberg having proposed to teach Lady Mary Maitland to write, after two or three lessons, the young lady shewed her mother several specimens, particularly the Ten Commandments in French, so well done, that my Lady suspected the same to be of the governess's writing, and accordingly questioned the child about it, who at first denied, but, being pressed a second time, owned the whole to be the performance of her tutorefs, by whom she had been desired to shew it as her own:
and

and this could not but be truth, as the young lady could not write even to the present hour. Being interrogated for Miss De Grosberg, whether, during her abode at Hatton, she conversed ridiculously at table? the deponent answered, she only remembered her giving an account of a brother, who (she said) had been wounded, and lost both his legs, both his ears, and an arm.

Leonardo Pescatore, Italian music-master in Edinburgh, deposed, That about six weeks after Miss De Grosberg left Lord Lauderdale's family, she applied to him to teach her to sing by note, with which she was before unacquainted; indeed, she could sing three or four songs by rote, but knew nothing of time, nor could she play upon the hapsichord or guitar, nor had she a good ear. He added, that she once asked him for catgut-gauze to sew a pair of ruffles for him, but (from her unsettled situation) did not execute above the half of one, and that (as far as he could judge) but indifferently. She reported herself to be daughter to the Count D'Affry, who having forced her to sign a contract of marriage with a gentleman at the Cape of Good Hope, the next morning early, accompanied by her chambermaid, quitted her father's house, and came to England. She further said, that the Marchioness De Nivernois, Countess D'Odion, was her aunt, lived at Cambray, and yearly sent her 100 guineas; and the deponent himself put into the post-house, by her desire, a letter addressed to a person so titled, to acquaint that lady of her niece's being then in distress, and to beg the remittance of 100 guineas, which was all she would ask for that year.

George Macqueen, merchant in Edinburgh, deposed, That, about the 4th of April, 1764, Mr. George Henderson delivered him a letter from Mr. James Stirling, merchant in Kingston, in Jamaica, recommending the bearer as a stranger to his notice and favour, in consequence of which he invited Mr. Henderson to dine at his house; but he excused himself on account of a young French lady, with whom he
came

came down, and who was going as a companion to Lady Lauderdale. Hereupon the deponent accompanied Mr. Henderson to the New Inn, and was introduced to Miss de Grosberg, whom he then asked to dine with Mr. Henderson at his house: however, they did not dine, but drank tea with him in the evening, after which they all went together to the play. Next day they dined at the deponent's mother-in-law's, and at night supped at his house. The day after they dined at Leith, and supped at the New Inn, which was the last time the deponent saw Miss De Grosberg before she went to Hatton. On none of these occasions did he hear her say any-thing concerning her family, further than once mentioning that her father was in this country in 1745, an officer in the French service; but she frequently pretended an acquaintance with great personages, particularly her Majesty, several ladies of the bedchamber, and the Duke of Cumberland at Newmarket. She also pretended, that she had obtained her guardian's leave to go for some time as a companion to Lady Lauderdale, in order to get rid of a Welch gentleman who had made his addresses to her. About ten or twelve days after she went to Hatton, the deponent received a message desiring his company at the New Inn, whither she was returned. When he was come there, she informed him that she had had a "dreadful outcast" with Lord and Lady Lauderdale, and principally because she proposed to go to see Mr. Henderson at Glasgow, which then, however, she was fully bent upon, and importuned the deponent to go with her, but he declined it. Some days after this interview, she called in a chaise at the deponent's house, telling him that she was just returned from seeing Mr. Henderson at Glasgow, and, as travelling had been expensive, asked him to lend her money to pay for the chaise; but this he declined also. Being interrogated as to the general tenor of her behaviour, the deponent answered, that he did not observe any-thing lewd in her conduct, though he was struck with some circumstances which in his idea were incompatible with the

N

character

character of a lady of fashion, as she pretended to be; particularly, when the deponent dined with her at Leith, as above mentioned, she called for and drank a dram, and, besides drinking more at and after dinner than ladies usually do, carried some porter and drank it in the billiard-room.

David Wardrop, surgeon in Edinburgh, deposed, That some time in the month of April, 1764, he was called upon to visit Miss De Grosberg at the New Inn, when she complained of a disorder in her stomach, and the fatigue of the journey, but said nothing of any bruises or blisters upon her, nor did the deponent see any.

John Baptist Beuzeville, minister to the French congregation in Edinburgh, deposed, That he had seen Miss De Grosberg at Piccardy, in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh, and had heard her say she was the daughter of Count D'Affry, formerly ambassador from the court of France to the States General, and that she had been in several nunneries. However, he observed such a changeableness in her manner, as to induce him to think her disordered in mind; and he wrote to a brother of his, a clergyman in London, enquiring whether she was such a person as deserved attention and regard. The answer he received was by no means favourable, representing her as having "misbehaved as a person of her sex," and as having been very troublesome to a gentleman, who said he knew her too well to recommend her to any person.

Helen Meals, wife of Robert Norrie, painter in Edinburgh, deposed, That she had heard Miss De Grosberg speak of her having lived with Mr. Crucifix within the palace, and often having access to see her Majesty.

[Thus far the proof taken at Edinburgh, commencing Jan. 30, and ending Feb. 8, 1765.]

Substance of the Proof taken at London.

Mrs. Elizabeth Fellows, of Princes-street, Leicester-fields, confirmed, on oath, every particular in which
we

we have mentioned she was concerned through the whole of this affair, and which it would be superfluous to repeat.

Joseph Cortissos, of Finch-lane, Cornhill, a Jew, deposed; That he knew the person who then passed by the name of De Grosberg, and who had applied to him for a character, and to give evidence in her behalf in the present action, by averring that he never knew her by any other name than De Grosberg; but which he refused to do, as she must be conscious he formerly knew her by the name of *De la Rochette*, and had received letters from her, of her own handwriting, so signed. The occasion of the deponent's correspondence with Miss De Grosberg, he said, was as follows:—Mr. Solomon De Silva, merchant, (a relation of the deponent,) became acquainted with Miss De Grosberg in London, in 1761. About April or May, 1762, Miss De Grosberg went to Exeter as a French tutorefs in a boarding-school there, and soon after signified to Mr. De Silva that she was with child by him; which information Mr. De Silva communicated to the deponent, intimating that he believed it might be true. Some time afterwards, Mr. De Silva having received an account of Miss De Grosberg's being brought to bed, and being to quit England in a few days, he recommended it to the deponent, as his friend, to correspond with Miss De Grosberg, and take care of the child. Accordingly various letters in French passed between them, and all from her under the name of *De la Rochette**, which was the name whereby

* Of one of these letters to Mr. Cortissos the following is a translation, by way of specimen:

“ Sir, I take the liberty of writing you, having received a letter from Mr. Silva by Mr. Sellon's servant, wherein he informs me, that he had accepted a bill for 25 pounds a moment before he went away; and that he had left an obligation in your hands for 40 pounds, to reimburse this 25 pounds, to which I believe Mr. Sellon gives no faith: for if that be true, Mr. Silva should have desired you to write Mr. Sellon, as to the reimbursement of that bill, you would pay him, that would have had a better effect, assuring you, that the kindness which Mr. Sellon has for me, deserves that he should have some assurance to be paid his money

whereby Mr. De Silva always mentioned her to the deponent, though in one letter she wrote to Mr. De Silva from Exeter she desired him to direct to her by the name of *Mal Faisans*. About the latter end of January, 1763, Miss *De la Rochette* (as she was then called) returned from Exeter to London; and, having several times changed lodgings, sent the deponent a letter, intimating that for the future she was to pass under the name of *De Grosberg*. In the beginning of February, 1763, an advertisement appearing in the papers for a governess to Governor Floyers's children, the deponent suggested to Miss De Grosberg to apply for that place, which (as she informed him) she accordingly obtained, by virtue of a character given her by Mr. Sellon, a merchant at Exeter. From this time the deponent saw nothing of Miss De Grosberg till the August following, when she told him, that, having been taken ill, she was then in lodgings at

money some time or other; for I don't know by what means in the world to acknowledge his goodness. If I could, by any possible means, get money, I would pay him myself; but that being out of my power, I beg you'll write him yourself, and give him some light or other into this affair: for me, I am frightened to speak to him, for fear that this story does not anger him, and make him have no regard for me and my child. I may say that Mr. Sellon has acted towards me as a father. I am surprised that Mr. Silva does not answer my letter. I wrote him of my being brought to bed. He sends me no answer what I am to do. I propose coming to London next Monday I don't know what to do, or where to come or my arrival. Mean time I have put the child out to nurse. I beg you will do me the favour of answering me by first post, in order that I may know what to do and say to Mr. Sellon. Mean time, I am, with respect, Sir, Your very humble servant,

DE LA ROCHETTE."

In a former letter, addressed to Mr. Silva, are the following curious passages: "I languish to see you; my time is ended, I believe; I cannot count it; it wants a few days; I tremble to think of lying-in here. Mr. Sellon said, I would be imprudent, if I gave you the child to bring up in your religion. I told him that was not his business; that you was the father of it; and that you should have it." --- "You cannot say, although I have prostitute myself, it was for the sake of gain; far from that: it was out of pure love; having, I dare assure you, too high sentiments for that."

Clapton,

Clapton, on board-wages; and soon afterwards the deponent understood she lodged at Hommerton, but still on board-wages, and in Governor Floyers's service. In consequence of Mr. De Silva's request, the deponent had at times given Miss De Grosberg money, at the rate of a guinea per month, for the care of the child, which, on her coming to London from Exeter, she told the deponent she had left at nurse near the last-mentioned place; which story he believed till towards the latter end of the year 1763, when he was informed by Mrs. Glass, (an acquaintance of both Miss De Grosberg and himself,) that Miss De Grosberg had a child at Hommerton, which was suckled by herself, seemed to be about four months old, and was a girl; whereas the child she pretended to have had by Mr. De Silva, the deponent always understood, both from Miss De Grosberg and Mr. Silva, to be a boy. Hence the deponent suspected Mr. Silva had been imposed upon, and by his order refused to give her any more money on account of his supposed child, till she produced it, which she refused. The deponent believed Miss De Grosberg to be a Dutch woman, as, in speaking English, she terminated her words with that accent; besides, she told him, she was the daughter of Count Bentinck, at the Hague, and had never been at Paris. The deponent did not know Mr. Sellon, of Exeter, nor did he believe he was any relation or guardian of Miss De Grosberg, but only pretended by her to be so; for, when she was about to try for Governor Floyers's place, she desired to make use of the deponent's name as her guardian, which falsehood he strictly forbid. The deponent then exhibited nine letters, five of which were written by Miss De Grosberg, either to Mr. De Silva or himself, from Exeter; the sixth to himself, on her coming to town from that place, but all signed *De la Rochette*; also four subsequent letters, written by the same hand, to himself, and signed *De Grosberg*: whence it was evident that *De la Rochette* and *De Grosberg* were different names for one and the same person.

Gilbert

Gilbert Sheldon, of Gerard-street, Soho, linen-draper, and his wife, the persons who were paying Mrs. Fellows a tea-visit on the Sunday afternoon when Miss De Grosberg first waited upon her, confirmed, (in every respect, Mrs. Fellows's account of what then passed, both in respect to terms, and the accomplishments which Miss De Grosberg professed herself capable of teaching.

Thomas Beelby, of Baldock, Hertfordshire, coachman, deposed, That he had been employed for twelve years to drive the Newcastle stage-coach from London to Baldock, and back again, and that, on inspecting the coach-books, he found a place taken for the 27th of March, 1764, by a Mrs. Grosback, who he believed accordingly set out in the said stage that night. He drove it himself, and therefore could aver, that the coach was not overturned or laid over on any bridge near Barnet or elsewhere, nor did any other accident happen to it, nor were any of the passengers put into any confusion, or receive any hurt, or complain of having any box broke or any thing lost; nor did any one desire him to make enquiry upon the road for a muff, nor carry any thing to Mr. Crucifix's, near St. James's.

Miss *Sarah Cortiffes*, sister to Joseph Cortiffes before examined, deposed, That she had often heard of the acquaintance between Miss De la Rochette and Mr. De Silva, and that the first time she saw her was on her coming to London from Exeter, when she acknowledged to the deponent, that she was the person who had had a boy by Mr. Silva, but which she had left at nurse near Exeter. The deponent further declared, that soon afterwards, Miss De la Rochette changed her name to *De Grosberg*, for this reason, as she told the deponent, that, as she had pretended to be the daughter of the Count de Bentinck, she might the more easily prevent a discovery of herself. Indeed, she had frequently told the deponent that she was that Count's daughter, and had run away from her friends at the Hague, because they would have her marry

marry the Governor of the Cape of Good Hope, who was an elderly man, and whom therefore she disliked.

James Macgill, of Hackney, linen-draper, deposed, That he knew a foreign woman of the name of Potter, who in 1763 lodged at Mr. Hole's house at Hackney, which same person had before lodged at Mr. Johnston's, at Clapton, under the same name of Potter. And the said Mrs. Potter had had address enough to procure from his shop, under various pretences, goods to the amount of 4l. 17s. for which he had never been paid. The deponent further declared, that Mrs. Potter told him the child of which she was brought to bed at Mr. Hole's was her first child.

Elizabeth Pentlow, wife of William Pentlow, of Hommerton, farmer, deposed, That, in the beginning of the year 1764, a woman who said her name was Potter, and that she was a native of France, hired one room in her house, at the rate of 5s. per week. She told the deponent that she had last lodged at Mr. Hole's, at Hackney, and had been there brought to bed of the little girl she had with her at the deponent's house, under the care of her servant Katharine Peet. This child was frequently suckled by the mother in the deponent's presence, and generally lay with her at night. Mrs. Potter was several times visited by Mrs. Westfall, (mentioned in Mr. Crucifix's deposition,) and once by Mr. and Mrs. Crucifix; but no woman, whom the deponent knew by the name of De Grosberg, visited Mrs. Potter whilst in the deponent's house. Mrs. Potter told the deponent she was twice married to Mr. Potter, first in France, and then in England, and that he was a Parliament-man; and on leaving her lodgings in March, Mrs. Potter pretended she was going to Exeter, to bury her husband's mother, and sell the estate; which done, she should return and settle in London. And the deponent positively declared, that the last time she saw the said Mrs. Potter, was on the 14th of that instant January, in a coach, near Mr. Henry Davidson's, in Poland-street, when she was pointed out to her by the agent for Lord Lauderdale, as Miss De Grosberg, and the plaintiff
in

in this cause. On thus seeing her in the coach, the deponent spoke to her, saying, Your servant, *Mrs. Potter*, whereupon she repeatedly said, I am not the person; nevertheless, the deponent was absolutely certain that she was the same person who had lodged at her house, and was known to her by the name of *Potter* aforesaid.

Margaret Harrison, sister to *Mrs. Pentlow*, besides confirming the particulars contained in the above examination, deposed, That, about the latter end of February, 1764, *Mrs. Potter* desired the deponent to accompany her to *Mrs. Fellows's* house, near *Leicester-fields*, which she accordingly did, in a coach belonging to one *Mr. Boon*, and remained therein by *Mrs. Potter's* desire, whilst she herself went into the house, where she continued about an hour; after which they both returned in the coach to *Hommerton*. This deponent also saw the said *Mrs. Potter* in a coach, at the time mentioned in the above deposition, near *Mr. Henry Davidson's* house in *Poland-street*, and spoke to her in the same manner as the above witness; and, as *Lord Lauderdale's* agent had pointed the same person out as *Miss De Grosberg*, the plaintiff in the present suit, she was very sure that *Miss De Grosberg* was the self-same person she had formerly known by the name of *Mrs. Potter*.

Deborah Marsom, of *Jerusalem-square*, midwife, deposed, That, on the 24th of July, 1763, she delivered *Mrs. Potter* of a girl, at the house of *Mr. Hole*, and was afterwards present at the christening, when the infant was named *Caroline*, and the sponsors were an old French gentleman, *Miss Mary Farar* (who lodged in the house), and *Mrs. Potter*, who said she stood proxy for a near relation of hers then abroad: and the deponent was sure that no woman of the name of *De Grosberg* stood god-mother, or visited *Mrs. Potter* whilst she attended her.

George Downing, of *Hackney*, surgeon and apothecary, deposed, That he knew *Mrs. Potter* whilst in lodgings at *Mr. Hole's*, and afterwards visited her at *Mrs. Pentlow's* in the way of his business, in the course

course of which he saw her give suck to the child she was brought to bed of at Mr. Hole's, bled her twice, and administered medicines both to her and her child, but never heard of any woman of the name of De Grosberg who visited her. The last time he saw the said Mrs. Potter, she was in a coach as above-mentioned, and pointed out to him by Lord Lauderdale's agent as *Miss De Grosberg*, the plaintiff in the cause; but the deponent was positive the person so pointed out was the identical woman he had attended, bled, and administered medicines to, as aforesaid, under the name of *Potter*.

Thomas Wright, of Hackney, vintner, deposed, That he was very well acquainted with Mrs. Potter both whilst she lodged at Mr. Hole's and Mrs. Pentelow's; and that she was no other than the very person who was pointed out by Lord L.'s agent to three witnesses already examined, with whom he was when she was seen in the coach near Mr. Davidson's.

James Sell, of Hackney, coachman, deposed, That he frequently drove Mrs. Potter from her lodgings, both at Mr. Hole's at Hackney, and Mrs. Pentelow's at Hommerton, to London, and back again; and also several times called upon her at Mr. Simons's house, the sign of the Civet-Cat, in Grace-church-street, London, in order to carry her down to her lodgings. And one Sunday, in the preceding winter, the deponent drove Mrs. Potter, accompanied by Mrs. Harrison (before-mentioned), to the house of Mrs. Fellows, near Leicester-fields, and back again. The last time he saw the said Mrs. Potter was when Lord L.'s agent pointed her out to him, together with four other witnesses, as *Miss De Grosberg*, and he knew her for certain to be the person he had driven as above set forth, and to whom he had frequently carried parcels directed to her by the name of *Potter*.

Mrs. *Mary Magdalene*, widow of Gabriel Risolieri, late of Newman's-court, Cornhill, surgeon and man-midwife, deposed, That, in the spring of the year 1763, a lady of the name of De Grosberg, being in a bad state of health, applied to the deponent's husband

band for assistance, to which she was recommended by one Mr. Bell, an acquaintance of Mr. Sellon*, merchant, at Exeter, and also by letters received from the said Mr. Sellon himself, who at times sent remittances of money for her use. She told the deponent, that she was then in the service of Governor Floyer, but must leave it, as she apprehended herself to be with child. She accordingly took lodgings, first at Clapton, and afterwards at Mrs. Hole's at Hackney, at which last she was, as she herself told the deponent, brought to bed of a girl. In 1764, in the spring, she informed this deponent she was going into Scotland, as governess to two young ladies of quality, and at the same time mentioned her having been sued, in the court of conscience, by one Thomas Hall, a coachman at Clapton, for a bill of coach-hires; which bill the said Hall afterwards brought to the deponent, who paid it, amounting to 11. 12s. 9d. but it was made out in the name of Potter, by which, the deponent found, the said De Grosberg was known to the said Hall. This bill the deponent produced, together with several letters received by her from the said De Grosberg, in her own hand-writing.

Nicholas Fourdain, of Christ-church, Middlesex, deposed, That he had frequently seen Miss De Grosberg at Mr. Risolier's house, and had been told by herself that she was delivered of a girl in lodgings at Mr. Hole's at Hackney, and at that very time went there by the name of Potter. The deponent further declared, that after Miss De Grosberg went to Scot-

* After all that has been said concerning Mr. Sellon, as Miss De Grosberg's guardian, perhaps the reader will be surprised to find the whole an imposition.—It being rumoured in Edinburgh, after our heroine had made her Declaration, that her advocate had received a letter from Mr. Sellon, confirming many things therein contained; Lord Lauderdale, desirous of knowing the truth, wrote to that gentleman, and from two letters he received in answer, it appeared, that Mr. Sellon was unacquainted with the process in question, had written no letter to Miss De Grosberg's advocate, was never guardian to any person, and, so far from having married Lady Holmes's sister (as was pretended in Miss De Grosberg's Declaration,) had never been married at all.

land,

land, he received a letter from Mr. Beuzeville, a French minister at Edinburgh, desiring to know whether she was a person deserving of favour; to which the deponent answered, that he did not think Miss De Grosberg deserving of protection, and that Mr. Beuzeville should be cautious that he was not imposed upon by her.

Susannah Bernard, wife of Henry Bernard, of Whitegate-alley, London, currier, deposed, That she lodged at Mr. Hole's, at Hackney, from the 18th of June to the 5th of October, 1763, and knew Mrs. Potter, who held one room there at the same time, wherein she was brought to bed of a girl, at the christening of which the deponent was present, when an old gentleman stood god-father, and Miss Farar (a lodger in the same house) and Mrs. Potter herself stood godmothers. No woman of the name of De Grosberg was there, nor did the deponent know any person so called.

Magdalen Lardant, of Church-street, Spitalfields, sister of the above witness, deposed, That Mrs. Potter asked her to stand godmother to a child of which she was delivered at Mr. Hole's, at Hackney, but the deponent refused.

Miss *Mary Farar*, of Fleet-street, London, millener, deposed, That she lodged at Mr. Hole's, at Hackney, during the month of July, 1763; and that another lodger, Mrs. Potter, being brought to bed of a girl, desired the deponent to stand godmother to the same, as representing her husband's mother, telling her at the same time that Miss Lardant (the last witness) would stand as the other godmother. Accordingly, the deponent did stand godmother as proxy for Mrs. Potter's husband's mother, but Mrs. Potter herself stood in the place of Miss Lardant. No person called De Grosberg was there, nor did the deponent ever see or hear of any one of that name who visited Mrs. Potter whilst she lodged at Mr. Hole's aforesaid.

The Hon. Capt. *John Maitland*, brother to the Earl of Lauderdale, confirmed the account already set forth of Miss De Grosberg's declining to play upon the

harpichord, imposing her own as Lady Mary's writing on Lady Lauderdale, and other particulars of her behaviour at Hatton, already mentioned, adding, that when a music-book was produced to her, she said she did not understand the music in that book, for the notes were written in a different way from the notes in France; and the deponent further declared, That, previous to Lord Lauderdale's receiving and opening the two letters from Mr. Crucifix and Katharine Peet, he had desired Miss De Grosberg voluntarily to shew him a letter or two, to remove some suspicions which from certain circumstances had arisen, but she refused, alledging, that she always burnt her letters as soon as she had read them. When Miss De Grosberg was about to quit the Earl's family, he asked her how she intended to discharge the 20l. she had borrowed of Mrs. Fellows, of Princes-street? To which she answered, that she was unable to pay it then, but would take care it should be paid; and in the mean time her portmanteau should remain in the hands of Mr. Robertson, the Earl's factor, and Mrs. Fellows's brother-in-law. And, upon leaving Hatton, Miss De Grosberg demanded from the Countess of Lauderdale money for her journey to London; whereupon her Ladyship offered her so much as would be sufficient to pay her expences by sea, or in a waggon by land. And the deponent declared further, that he was present when Lord L.'s agent pointed out the said Miss De Grosberg in a coach near Mr. Davidson's, to Mrs. Pentelow, Mrs. Margaret Harrison, Mr. George Downing, Mr. Thomas Wright, and James Sell, five witnesses before examined, who all spoke to her by the name of Mrs. Potter, and averred to the deponent that she was the very person they had before known by that name; and the deponent was positive, that the person so addressed by them was the self-same Miss De Grosberg whom he knew to have been engaged in Lord Lauderdale's family, and who was the plaintiff in this cause.

Henry Davidson, of Poland-street, Westminster, gentleman, deposed, That having been nominated a Commissioner for taking the depositions of witnesses

to be adduced in behalf of Miss De Grosberg, he appointed the 9th of January for that purpose, on which day she attended. But, during the examination of one of the witnesses, Miss De Grosberg more than once interrupting the said witness, the deponent thought it his duty to tell her, that she must not break in upon the witness whilst giving an answer to a question, but might afterwards put any questions she thought proper for an explanation; upon which Miss De Grosberg said, If so, it signified nothing her being there, and it would be better for her to be absent, as she was not sure that she should be able to keep her temper; and then left the room. In consequence of this, on the finishing of the business for that day, notice was given to Miss De Grosberg's agent, that her personal attendance at the examination of the witnesses was absolutely necessary, the question being in a great measure a question of personal identity. Nevertheless, on the 12th of January, the next appointed day for taking depositions, Miss De Grosberg did not attend, and Lord L.'s agent insisting that the business should be further postponed till she should attend, the deponent did accordingly adjourn the same till the 14th of January. About noon that day, the deponent being in his parlour next Poland-street, in company with the Hon. Capt. John Maitland, and Lord L.'s agent, a coach stopped at his house, on which the deponent went immediately to the door, and saw Miss De Grosberg and Katharine Peet (a witness that day afterwards examined) with a child in her arms, in the coach. The said Katharine Peet, with the child, came out of the coach into his house, but on the deponent's offering to help Miss De Grosberg out, she told him that she was going a little further, but would return in a quarter of an hour, which the deponent pressed her not to fail of doing. She then ordered the coachman to drive off, which brought Lord L.'s agent out of the parlour, saying he was sure she did not mean to return, and that, if he could not then shew her to Lord Lauderdale's witnesses, he should never, with her will, have another opportunity;

ty; and forthwith he and Capt. Maitland ran after the coach up Great-Marlbrough-street, at the bottom of which the deponent's house stands. They both soon returned; when Lord L.'s agent represented, that, as he had had an opportunity of pointing out Miss De Grosberg to certain witnesses intended to be examined on the part of the defendant, so that they were thereby enabled to swear positively to her person, he should not oppose the deponent's proceeding in the execution of his commission aforesaid, which he then did.

The said agent for the Earl of Lauderdale, having confirmed Mr. Davidson's testimony as far as the adjournment of the examinations of witnesses to the 14th of January, proceeded to enlarge upon the subsequent transactions of that day in the following manner:— He deposed, That, from Miss De Grosberg's behaviour (above-mentioned by Mr. Davidson) on the first day of executing the commission granted in her own behalf, and from her not appearing pursuant to notice given on the second day, he apprehended she intended to avoid (if possible) being seen by any of Lord Lauderdale's witnesses, but would, if she came, at all, only appear for a short time to the Commissioner and her own witnesses, and then go off again, but thus shewing a seeming compliance with the notice given to her. The deponent, therefore, desired Mr. Thomas Wright, vintner, and Mr. George Downing, apothecary, both of Hackney, (who had informed the deponent that they were well acquainted with Mrs. Potter) to come to town, on the morning of the said 14th of January, and bring with them Mrs. Pentelow, (at whose house she had lodged) and Mrs. Harrison (her sister), and that they would get James Sell, who had usually driven Mrs. Potter, to drive them to town; and the deponent likewise desired them to go to the Argyll-arms, in Argyll-street, and continue there, until he, or some messenger from him, should come to them. On the 14th of January aforesaid, being with Capt. Maitland at Mr. Davidson's, a coach stopped at the door, out of which came Katharine Peet with a child; but Miss De Grosberg declining to come out also, on the pre-
tence

tence mentioned above by Mr. Davidson, the deponent expressed himself to the purport set forth in Mr. Davidson's deposition, and together with Capt. Maitland, and a chairman hired to be in waiting, followed the coach, which stopping at the end of Marlborough-street, the deponent judged that a favourable opportunity to get Mr. Wright and the other persons above-mentioned to see the plaintiff, and thereupon he hastened to the Argyll-arms; and finding the said five persons there, they followed him down Argyll-street as fast as they could. By this time the coach had turned about, and was beginning to go down Marlborough-street; but the driver being desired to stop, the deponent brought the said witnesses to the coach-door, and shewing the plaintiff (Miss De Grosberg) to them, they all spoke to her by the name of *Mrs. Potter*, and assured him that she was identically the same person they had formerly known as such: upon which he went and consented to Mr. Davidson's proceeding in his commission. The deponent further declared, that he had been informed by Mr. Cortissos, that he apprehended, from some enquiries made of him by Mr. J— S——, a witness examined in behalf of Miss De Grosberg, that the said Mr. S—— knew Miss De Grosberg by the name of Potter, before he arrested her, notwithstanding he had deposed to the contrary; which had induced the deponent to search the proper office in which the affidavit to warrant the writ was filed, and, in so doing, he found the said affidavit, whereby the said Mr. S—— had made oath, That there was due to him from Caroline Grosberk, otherwise *Carolina Potter*, 6l. and upwards;—a copy of which affidavit was produced.

J— S—— (mentioned in the latter part of the above deposition) deposed, That, since he was examined on the part of the plaintiff, he had read the affidavit authorising the arrest mentioned in his deposition, of which he believed the paper-writing produced by the former witness to be a true copy. And the deponent had reason to believe, from the perusal of the said affidavit, that he must, at the time of his making the same, have understood, that the said plaintiff

tiff passed and was known by the name of Potter as well as that of Grosberk.

[The proceedings under this commission, begun on the 17th of January, 1765, were closed on the 9th of February following, by the Commissioner's and Clerk's certifying, that Miss De Grosberg herself did not attend any part of the preceding examinations; and that her agent had been present at taking the depositions of Mrs. Fellows and Mr. Cortislos only; notwithstanding it had been by due notice signified to them, that, in case of Miss De Grosberg's absence, she would be holden as confessed to be the person whom Messrs. Wright and Downing, Mrs. Pentelow, and Mrs. Harrison, saw in the coach in Marlborough-street as above-mentioned.]

HERE we are unwillingly compelled to break off abruptly, the prosecutrix not thinking proper to proceed any farther in her suit, especially as the Court, for reasons best known to themselves, had rejected her appeal to a jury of matrons, the method by which she proposed to ascertain her personal purity and virgin innocence. Whether this offer was made as the last resource of injured modesty, and in full confidence of a refusal, we shall not pretend to determine; it seems, however, to have been the desperate effort of declining credit, and the only method she had left to overturn the veracity of the testimony against her, which the generality of mankind will probably venture to pronounce full and decisive as to one article, viz. that *Mrs. Potter* and *Miss De Grosberg* are one and the same person. Upon this solid and substantial foundation we leave the candid reader to raise the superstructure, and to form his notions from thence of the other parts of her character and conduct.

Could

Could we follow this female adventurer through the whole of her fortunes, and trace her through the mazes and subterfuges in which she visibly attempts to lose her pursuers, her history and anecdotes would, we fancy, form a very entertaining memorial. But the misfortune is, that we not only know nothing of our heroine's origin and character, prior to Mr. Cortisso's account of her, but, with the waving of her suit, we lose sight of her till the year 1767, when the following article appeared in the public prints :

Nov. 24. Madame the Marchioness de Vilarno, born Princess of Montmorenci, died at her seat near Cambray in France, leaving a fortune of 100,000l. sterl. which she has disposed of as follows: 10,000l. to the convent of Carmelites; 10,000l. for masses for her soul; 10,000l. to the charity of the foundlings, and the poor of her parish; and 20,000l. to her distant relations and the nearest in her service: the other 50,000l. to her great niece Caroline, Countess of Grosberg, now resident in England.

With what view this was inserted in the newspapers, we shall not presume to assert; only we cannot help remarking, that the legacies are expressed to have been given in sterling English coin, although it is usual in foreign articles of intelligence to mention all sums of money in livres. If this paragraph should not have been contrived and calculated to further any new purpose, and to raise extraordinary credit, we cannot otherwise account for it. However, after this period, we do not remember to have even heard the name of *De Grosberg* till it was revived on a *late occasion*. Perhaps matrimony may have given a *legal* title to a new one, or her noble blood may have been enriched by a still nobler pedigree, and exalted into *royal*.

It is not, however, any violation of candour to enumerate the different names which she assumed, as it appears from the foregoing evidence, particularly that of Mr. Cortissos, and the corroborating testimony of her own letters, to answer different purposes, and the various exigencies of her fluctuating fortunes; such as those of *De la Rochette*, *De Grosberg*, *Malsaisans*, and *Potter*: and it cannot escape our readers notice that two of these titles were ascribed to the *very personage* to whom these sheets are dedicated, on her late trial*. This, it must be confessed, is a remarkable incident, and inquisitive persons may take advantage of it, by suggesting that not only the different names appear to be united in that lady, but likewise that there are many other concurring circumstances which mark the two characters, and create a most striking resemblance between them. For instance, they will probably say, they both appear to be excellent *pen-women*, quick at *invention*, full of *and intrigue*, *boasters of high descent*, pretending to *fine feelings*, and the *nicest sense of honour*. But away with all these WILD INSINUATIONS and RANDOM CONJECTURES, and let us persuade our INJURED FAIR not to regard them, but to treat them with silence and contempt. What signify the throws of a malicious world to her who has passed her *fiery trial*, received her acquittal at the bar of public justice, and returned in triumph, refined like gold from the fire. Let her remember that *similarity* and *identity* are quite different things, and let her, wrapped in her robes of innocence, bid defiance to the malice of all her enemies!!!

* See the Dedication.

E I N

